

THE MUSLIM WORLD

VOL. XL

OCTOBER, 1950

No. 4

CHRISTIAN AMERICA STUDIES THE NEAR EAST

During the next few months the attention of the churches in Canada and the United States will be focussed on the Christian mission to Muslims. Not since 1938 have the denominations cooperating in the Missionary Education Movement made a special study of Islam and the peoples who profess that faith. Since then the Near East as a political tinder-box has become familiar to millions of Americans whose only knowledge of that area before World War II was of Palestine in Biblical times. Now many of these will study the Near East in its current religious setting. For those of us who love that area and yearn that all its people may know the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, this is good news, for perhaps the stimulus of this special emphasis will lift up work among Muslims from its relatively unknown and neglected status to the central place in missions strategy where it belongs.

After more than a century of missionary endeavor in the Near East from Morocco to Iran, only eleven American Protestant denominations have work there, and five of these are smaller bodies with only a few missionaries on the field. Canada has no missions in the area. Thus millions of Christian people have had no direct channel for their prayers and gifts to reach their brothers in the Near East, and perhaps the most difficult missionary task in the world is being undertaken by only a small segment of the Christian forces of the Western hemisphere. A wonderful result of this year of special study would be a concern for the Near East on the part of all our Protestant denominations. There is room for the founding of new missions, as well as an unlimited opportunity to further the cause of Christ there by sharing in the interdenominational approach through the promotion of literacy and Christian literature, and in special work for ref-

ugees and those who are afflicted with leprosy and blindness.

What will be Christian America's appraisal of work among Muslims in this year of special study? As one reads through the excellent materials which have been provided, the conviction grows that Christian work in the Near East, far from being sterile in results, as some would say, has been remarkably effective. The wonder is that so few have accomplished so much in the face of enormous difficulties and almost impossible conditions. Maurice Hindus, who as a Jew could hardly be accused of wishful missionary thinking, makes clear in his able book *In Search of a Future* that missionaries have been right in digging at the moral and spiritual roots of Near East problems. It is far too soon for us to appraise the ultimate effect on Near East countries of the decades of teaching Christian principles, the unselfish ministry of healing, the widespread Christian literature, the quiet supplanting of Muhammad by Jesus Christ as the norm of human conduct, the influence of hundreds of missionary personalities on tens of thousands of Near East people, young and old. All this will represent a large part of the solid foundations of the new Near East countries which are in the making today. Charles Malik of Lebanon is an example of what the future will bring forth in Near East and world leadership resulting from missionary influences.

It is true that the conversion of Muslims seems still far in the future in most Near East countries, but that barrier may crumble much sooner than many now have faith to believe. Thrilling stories come from some of the most difficult fields as to little groups of converts who are openly braving persecution and actively propagating their new faith. The established freedom of conversion with only minimum disabilities which obtains in Iran, may soon be the rule in other Near East countries. The writer has just documented an account of one former Muslim Iranian family where the fourth generation are now Christians, a family which has already contributed a number of leaders to the Evangelical Church there. Surely all who are devoted to Near East missions have cause for profound gratitude to God.

Cannot experience in bringing Christ to Muslims also be a great inspiration in many other missionary areas today? Christians cannot accept the control of Communism in some countries as final or believe that we have no mission to win Communists to Christ. Where can the Christian mission better look for techniques in the enormously difficult evangel to Communists than to the approach of Christianity to Islam, so similar in its totalitarian demand on the whole personality and its refusal to brook any opposition? If even Muhammad is slowly yielding to the winsomeness of Christ, will not Marx and Lenin also eventually give way to His love in the hearts and lives of His disciples? We of the mission to Muslims have much of hope to offer to our brothers living and working in Communist areas.

Thus those workers in Muslim lands who have often taken comfort in the thought that "they also serve who only stand and wait" can find new hope and courage in present evidences of solid accomplishments, in the prospect that a fuller understanding of the area by our churches will mean more support for their efforts, and in the assurance that, in God's own good time, "the Kingdom of the world will become the Kingdom of our Lord and of His Christ."

WILLIAM N. WYSHAM

New York City

STORIES OF JESUS AND MARY

The John Rylands Library, Manchester, possesses a manuscript entitled *The story of Jesus son of Mary (blessing and peace be upon him and his mother), and what happened to them along with the disciples and others*. It is No. 664 in A. Mingana's *Catalogue of the Arabic Manuscripts in the John Rylands Library, Manchester*. The MS. has 35 folios with 15 lines to the page, and the handwriting, although not good, is very legible. Mingana reads the name attached to the MS. as 'Alī al-Bakrī, but the word which he reads as "Bakrī" has been scraped out, so that one cannot be sure what it is. This man calls himself *kātib*, thus claiming to be merely a copyist. Throughout the MS. *qāl*, or *qāl ṣāhib al-ḥadīth* appears frequently to make it clear that someone is being quoted. *Qāl* is always in red. The writer may therefore merely have copied out the stories for his own interest, but he has taken care to add his own name and the date when he finished the MS. 15th Šafar, 1173 (8th October, 1759). Mingana remarks, "The work consists of anecdotes concerning Jesus and Mary, and of miracles performed by the former, most of which are of a puerile character not mentioned in the canonical Gospels." That the stories are puerile is beyond question, yet this work has its interest as showing what a Muslim can record, and presumably believe, about Jesus and Mary. Generally one can trace his sources, but at times one can only attribute to him a very lively imagination. I give a brief summary of the MS. followed by some general remarks.

The writer begins by quoting Qur'ān III.30, "Verily Allah chose Adam, Noah, the family of Abraham and the family of 'Imrān over the worlds," then tells of Mary being left an orphan and of 12,000 pious people, including Zakariyā, considering what should be done. Zakariyā prayed for guidance and was told to command the B. Isrā'īl to write their names and their fathers' names on their reeds and throw them into the sea. The man whose reed floated was to be Mary's guardian. They did so, and God ordered the angel of the sea to allow only Zakariyā's reed to float. So he became Mary's guardian.

When Mary was twelve he built her a mosque in which she fasted by day and kept vigils. He brought her food, but when he forgot it one day the angels were distressed, and Gabriel and Michael were sent to take her some fruit from Paradise. When Zakariyā saw it he was impressed and quoted Qur. III.32. Mary was greatly perplexed when she began to menstruate, but God explained to her that this was decreed for women. He told her to abandon her devotions for seven days, then wash in the spring of Salwān. While she washed God sent Gabriel and Michael with "the purple dome" and 7,000 angels to screen her.

Gabriel was ordered to take the handful which Adam sneezed¹ and cast it into Mary's tunic. He appeared to her in the form of a youth called Taqī, and when she found that she could not avoid him, she sat down. He then explained who he was and why he had come, blew the handful into her tunic and ascended to heaven. Then God commanded it to be assimilated and become Jesus. Mary was visited one day by an old woman called Raḥma who noticed that she was pregnant, and informed the people. Iblīs appeared in the guise of one of their shaikhs and said he had seen a beardless youth visiting Mary nightly. So they sent Yūsuf who was noted for truthfulness to investigate, and after much talk between him and Mary Jesus spoke to him from her womb. This greatly impressed him, as it did the people when he reported it.

When the time came to bear Jesus Gabriel took Mary one cold, dark night to Bethlehem and seated her beside a dry, crooked palm tree eighty years old, then ascended to heaven. Mary, to the distress of the angels, suffered great pain, so Gabriel was sent back to her and taught her to invoke God using the name of the Arab prophet Muḥammad, saying that when the angels did so their requests were granted. She prayed thus and God immediately sent Gabriel to her again. He told Mary to raise her left arm, as Jesus was God's Word and Spirit and so could not be born in the usual way. She did so, Gabriel touched her left side with a feather of his wings, and Jesus came forth. A light spread up to the sky, and he praised God. Mary found that the tree had become fruitful. The fruit bent down, Mary shook it, and Jesus began to pick it up and exhort her to eat.

Ibn 'Abbās is quoted as saying that when Jesus was born Iblīs came to the B. Isrā'īl in the guise of an old wood-cutter to tell them. Twelve hundred of them went out to kill Mary and her child, and Jesus not only spoke to them from Mary's arms, but ran up a hill and addressed them. Zakarīyā then took Jesus in his arms and acknowledged him as a prophet. Gabriel then took Mary to a height beyond Damascus, but Ja'far al-Šādiq is quoted as saying that it was in the Kūfa district. There Mary built a hermitage for worship. One day she saw a schoolmaster in the town, and Jesus agreed to be sent to his school. Then follows a version of the well-known story of Jesus teaching the master the meaning of the letters of the alphabet. Mary was pleased when she returned and found Jesus in the master's place and the master in the pupil's. Another day Mary saw a dyer and suggested that Jesus should learn his trade. On being left alone one day, Jesus put all the clothes into a vessel with black dye and the master, on his return, bewailed his misfortune. Jesus declared that he was

¹ Adam was said to have been created from seven handfuls of earth.

going to show God's power, so the people were collected and he drew out every man's garment with the desired color. Last came a Jewess who, when she got the color she asked, demanded a different one and got it. When this had been repeated several times she said Jesus was a great magician, so he cursed her. Then 1330 men believed at Jesus' hand.

When Jesus had grown up and God had taught him all the sciences, he went at God's command to a city called Barqā which had 80 gates, in each of which were 80,000 men who did not believe in the one God. Jesus took the teacher with him. On the way every mountain became a plain and he walked on every river. Jesus sent the teacher to proclaim to the king that there is only one God and that Jesus is His Spirit, Word and Prophet. He was beheaded and his body was thrown out of the city. At night Jesus, after using some effective prayers, restored him to life, then sent him back to the city. This time his flesh was boiled and thrown to the wild beasts to eat. At night Jesus called them to disgorge what they had eaten, restored him to life and sent him back a third time. The king then went out with his army and people to see Jesus, who took them to the cemetery and brought the king's parents to life. They arose praising God and telling how they had suffered severe torments with a respite only on Thursday nights and Fridays. They exhorted the king to believe in Jesus and were then returned to their graves, after which the king and all his army believed, and they wrote on the city gate, "There is no god but God. Jesus is the Spirit and Word of God."

After this Jesus and Mary abandoned the world and built a mosque on a mountain top where they spent their time in devotions and lived on grass, herbs and water. One day when Jesus was away collecting herbs the angel of death took Mary's soul. When he returned Jesus thought she was asleep, but next morning he realized that she was dead. His violent grief made the angels in heaven and the wild beasts in the jungle weep. A voice from heaven told Jesus to prepare for Mary's funeral. Gabriel and Michael brought some of the Hūr to wash Mary. Graveclothes of silk and brocade, and balm and perfume were brought. Gabriel saw to the digging of the grave, and 70,000 angels attended the funeral. Afterwards Jesus prayed in Muḥammad's name that God would allow Mary to tell him her experiences in death and was permitted to call her. She complained at being disturbed, then spoke of the severity of the pangs of death and of God's mercy. She assured him that they would, God willing, meet in Paradise.

Jesus set out wandering and came at a time of prayer to a very high mountain with a spring of water at the foot. When he found

the water salty and bitter he asked the mountain the reason, and it said the spring came from its tears because it wept continuously owing to fear lest it might be included in the fuel of hell (cf. Qur. II.22). It asked Jesus to pray that it might be delivered, and when he did so a voice called that his prayer was answered. The spring disappeared and was replaced by one of cold, sweet water.

Jesus next went along a river and out into the sea without getting his feet wet and reached an island on which he was to meet a saint whose end was near. The saint, who was seventy cubits tall, was blind, yet he recognised Jesus because he had been warned of his coming. From the waist upwards he had the form of a man, but from the waist downwards he was a piece of wood growing out of the earth. A huge bird which daily brought him food and drink arrived, and Jesus and he ate and gave thanks. Jesus was told that the saint would die at midday and that he must wait and pray over him. At midday the trunk began to tremble and sway, the saint made confession of faith, then his soul left his body. Graveclothes, etc. came down, the angels prepared him for burial, and Jesus prayed over him.

Jesus next went to the largest island, whose king was an infidel. He sat below a castle where he was seen by an old woman called Tūqaryā who sent him food; but he refused it unless she and her people believed. She replied that she would believe if his God could cure her son who was suffering from a wasting disease. Jesus threw his cloak over him, prayed two *rak'as*, used some effective supplications, then sprinkled water from his mouth three times over his body. The youth immediately recovered and arose testifying to God's unity and to Jesus being God's Spirit. The woman and all in her castle believed. The youth was sent to call the king to believe, and was killed and thrown out of the city. Jesus brought him back to life with the help of his cloak and sent him back. He was again killed, then his remains were burned and pounded and scattered outside the city. Jesus called the winds to bring them together, laid his cloak on them and told the youth to get up. Jesus then sent him back to demand the king's daughter in marriage and half the kingdom. The king asked as dowry 500 camels loaded with various foods and 500 loaded with gold, silver and precious stones. The youth promised to produce them the following day, and when the thousand camels came to be loaded Jesus took them to the sea and ordered that they be loaded with water and sand. When the loads were opened they were found to contain what the king had demanded, so he and all his people believed, the youth got what he had requested, and after the king's death he succeeded him.

Jesus next found a man weeping at his wife's grave, so he raised

her to life. On the man pleading that she might be allowed to remain alive and offering her half the remainder of his life, his request was granted.

A Jew called Yahūdā expressed a desire to follow Jesus, but he had really made an agreement with the Jews to kill him. He took Jesus to his house and went out ostensibly to get food, actually to tell the Jews where Jesus was. They came, but God hid Jesus from their eyes. Yahūdā sought and found Jesus and was exhorted to abandon his error. Being sent by Jesus, he got three loaves from a tree, but ate one and took only two to Jesus. A shepherd gave Jesus a sheep which he killed and prepared, telling Yahūdā to eat the flesh but not to break the bones. Afterwards Jesus collected the bones, touched them with his staff, said some words which restored the flesh, then told the sheep to get up. It arose testifying to God's unity and to Jesus being His Spirit. The Jew thought him a great magician. One day three gold bricks came out of the earth to Jesus, and when the Jew, on being asked, insisted that he had received only two loaves, Jesus gave him two bricks, one of which sank into the earth. Jesus left him there and Yahūdā got the help of two passers-by to ease up the brick. While they were doing so he poisoned a loaf. They killed him, ate the loaf and died. Jesus passed by, struck the Jew with his stick and brought him to life. He made the gold disappear, then struck the other two men with his stick and they came to life. Jesus then took the Jew to the sea, and when he stretched out his hand two large fish appeared. He broiled them, then told the Jew to eat the flesh and not to break the bones; but when Jesus left him he disobeyed. When Jesus returned he rebuked him, then gathered the bones and prayed over them, whereupon the fish moved and fell into the sea. The Jew thought this was mighty magic, and as he decided that the magic lay in the staff, he stole it and fled. Coming to a city where the king was dying he offered to cure him, but when he struck the king with the staff he killed him and was in his turn killed by the people. The angels snatched the stick and returned it to Jesus, telling him what had happened, whereupon Jesus said, "To Jahannam, and evil is the destination."²

Jesus was met by Iblīs in the form of an old man. He suggested to him that he was divine because he had no father, was able to make birds of clay, could walk dryshod on water, raise the dead and provide people with food; but when Jesus had countered each suggestion by giving the praise to God, Iblīs left in despair. He returned in youthful form and made further suggestions regarding the divinity of Jesus,

² This is a misquotation of Qur. III.10, as it ends with the word used in LXVII.6.

but he countered them by quoting the Qur'ān. When he left Jesus again, God sent Gabriel, Michael and Israfil with 1000 angels to surround Jesus. Iblis was chased and thrown into a hot well where he was kept for seven days. A voice from heaven cried to Jesus the words of Qur.V.109 and other assurances.

Jesus came to Ṭabariya and went round the streets calling men to believe in the one God and in him as God's prophet. A monk asked what proof he had, and when Jesus produced a bat from clay and made it fly, the monk believed. Jesus then went round healing the sick, and all the people believed.

When Jesus asked for helpers twelve men came to him.³ They became very hungry, so he prayed that a table might be sent down. When a red cover descended between two clouds, Jesus wept and prayed that they might be grateful. He sat beside it and uncovered it, displaying a broiled fish with gravy flowing over it, salt at its head, and vinegar, vegetables and olives at its tail. The leading disciple asked whether it was food of this world or of the next, and Jesus, first rebuking him, said it was neither, but a special creation. The disciples asked another sign to perfect their faith and Jesus made the fish come alive. It moved and became an immense size. The disciples were afraid to eat, so Jesus summoned the poor, the sick, those afflicted with elephantiasis, and the blind. Thirteen hundred men and women ate and were satisfied, yet there was no change on the fish. It then flew out of sight. All sufferers who had eaten were cured. Rich and poor crowded round, so the fish came down on alternate days, and Jesus ordered rich and poor to come in turns. But when a voice from heaven told Jesus to appoint a table for the poor and needy, the rich objected and said the table did not come down from heaven. After warning against unbelief had been given, thirty-three disciples were changed into swine.

Jesus foretold the coming of Muḥammad and said his people would be the best people. They would recite the Qur'ān, fast during Ramaḍān, make pilgrimage, observe prayer and pay alms, command what was reputable and prohibit what was disreputable. Jesus continued wandering about till God took him up at the age of thirty-five. He will descend and regulate everything. He will kill the anti-christ, and corruption will lessen for forty years. He will marry and have two sons, then will die.

This summary shows that, while the writer has drawn on well-known sources, he is inclined to embellish his stories out of his own imagination by magnifying their marvels. When al-Zamakhsharī⁴

³ Qur. III.45.

⁴ Comm. on Qur. III.32.

comments on casting reeds to decide on Mary's guardian, he says that the number who did so was 27, whereas this MS. speaks of 12,000 consulting about the matter. But it should be said that in the Protevangelium of James all the widowers of the nation were told to bring their staves (cf. Gospel of Pseudo-Matthew). Al-Zamakhsharī says the reeds were to be cast into a river, but the MS. prefers the sea. Jesus is said not only to have spoken in infancy, but to have run up a hill and addressed the people from there. In recounting the story of Jesus with the dyer the MS. is not content with the normal tale that all the people received their clothes from the same vessel in the color they desired; it must add the fantastic detail of the Jewess who, each time she got the color she had asked, kept demanding another. Al-Tha'labī⁵ tells of a young man who was sent to demand the king's daughter in marriage, but it is not nearly so remarkable as the one given here. In al-Tha'labī's story the young man is merely beaten, but here he is twice killed and brought back to life. The ending is also different. In al-Tha'labī's account the young man is so impressed to think how Jesus who can produce great riches is content to remain poor, that he renounces the world and follows Jesus; but the author of the MS. gives the story a kind of "lived happily ever after" ending. Not content with this story, the MS. duplicates it by telling of the teacher being sent to a city where he was twice killed and brought back to life. Qur.LXI.6 merely says that Jesus foretold the coming of Aḥmad; the MS. makes him foretell the main practices of Islam and boost the Arabs.

Perhaps the section which contains the strangest features is that connected with Mary. For once the author falls short of apocryphal Gospels and al-Zamakhsharī in suggesting that it was only on one occasion that Mary received food from heaven, whereas they declare that this was her normal provision. He makes a curious error in the account of the Annunciation, saying that Gabriel appeared in the form of a youth called Taqī, taking the word which appears in Qur. XIX.18 as a proper name. Al-Zamakhsharī says that Gabriel appeared in the form of a youth called Yūsuf. It is surprising to be told that Gabriel was the one who took Mary to Bethlehem. The author finds no difficulty in Mary being told to pray to God using Muḥammad's name in her invocation, or in Jesus using the same invocation when praying that Mary might be allowed to speak to him after her death. It is strange to be told that Mary died before Jesus. Muslim sources generally know enough not to make a mistake like this. But while the writer has gone astray in his chronology, he obviously has behind his story some acquaintance with Christian accounts of Mary's death, which tell of Jesus coming with the angels

⁵ *Qiṣaṣ al-anbiyā'.*

from heaven and bringing heavenly garments to shroud her body.⁶

The story of the saint half man and half wood is very curious. It is difficult to see where it can have arisen other than from the author's lively imagination.

The account of Iblis appearing in two different forms to Jesus and attempting to make him claim that he is divine must have behind it some information about the Temptation in the Wilderness. In the Gospel story Jesus counters Satan by quoting the Old Testament; in this MS. by quoting the Qur'an. The appearance of the angels at the end of the story is also clearly a suggestion of the Gospel account, but the author, true to type, gives rather a weird description of the chase and punishment of Iblis.

In the story of the young man whose wife was raised from the dead the version here given is much shorter than the usual account which goes on to tell how the wife later proved unfaithful to her husband. The ending in the MS. is not quite satisfactory, so, as it comes at the end of a folio, it is quite possible that one folio at least is missing at this point.

The MS. is not really of any importance, but it is of interest to know that such a MS. exists, as it provides additional evidence of the desire in certain Muslim circles to know something about Jesus, although it presents a very different picture from the one we find in the Gospels. While no doubt many Muslims still believe stories of this type, modern educated Muslims show a tendency to discount the miraculous and think of Jesus merely as a messenger.⁷

In addition to works mentioned above, further information on the subject will be found in Zwemer's *The Moslem Christ* and Asin y Palacios, *Logia et Agrapha Domini Jesu* (Patrologia Orientalis, xiii, xix), in both of which further references are given. It should also be of interest to consult Sylvain Grébaud, *Les miracles de Jésus* (Patrologia Orientalis, xii, xiv, xvii) and E. A. Wallis Budge, *The History of the Blessed Virgin Mary*.

JAMES ROBSON

Manchester University

⁶ Cf. Forbes Robinson, *Coptic Apocryphal Gospels*, 33ff., 52ff., 91ff. *New Coptic Texts from the Monastery of Saint Macarius*, ed. by G. Evelyn White, 55ff. M. R. James considers that "the legend was first elaborated, if it did not originate, in Egypt" (*The Apocryphal New Testament*, 194).

⁷ Cf. THE MOSLEM WORLD, 1939, pp. 49ff.

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN SHARĪ'A LAW

A movement for the reform of Sharī'a law is in progress today in almost all the Arab countries in the Middle East. Considerable reforms have already been introduced in Egypt and, to a lesser degree, the Sudan; while innovations based on much the same principles have been introduced in Lebanon and Syria, in Palestine and the Hashimite Kingdom of Jordan, and—to a very limited degree—in Iraq. In addition comprehensive codes of the law of personal status are in draft in the last named country and in Syria; a code of the law of testate and intestate succession is before the Lebanese Parliament; and the completion of a comprehensive code for Egypt seems only a matter of time.

These developments are of considerable importance from several points of view. In the first place they show the Sharī'a to be a living system of law, capable—in spite of many affirmations to the contrary—of at least partial adaptation to modern life. Secondly, they constitute a mirror of the course of social reform in these now independent Arab (and mostly Muslim) countries. Thirdly, they provide a most valuable side-light on the progress of modernism in Islam, where theology and law largely go hand in hand: for the reforms do not only concern detailed practice but involve a number of the basic concepts of Muslim jurisprudence. It is hoped, therefore, to give a reasonably full account of the more interesting of these reforms in a series of articles.

Broadly speaking, all these present-day developments take the form of legislation which introduces, with the force of statute law, partial or complete codifications of those parts of the Sharī'a which are actually applied by the Courts. This, of course, at once raises the problem of the mutual spheres of the divine and man-made law, together with the further question of whether the Sharī'a can properly be codified at all. These modern codifications, moreover, are not based on the views of any one school of law—or even, for that matter, on the accepted views of all or any of the schools of law mutually recognised as orthodox in Islam today—but rather on an eclectic principle of choosing the rules which seem most suited to modern life from the dicta of any recognised school or reputable jurist. This has sometimes involved the acceptance not only of the views of early jurists who flourished before the formal schools crystallized, but also those of extinct schools such as the Zāhirīs, of somewhat eccentric jurists such as Ibn Taymīya and Ibn Qayyim al-Jawzīa, and even of the conclusions of "schismatic" schools such as those of the Zaydī and Ja'fārī sub-sects of the Shī'a. In addition, the views of two or more jurists have often been so combined in a single

matter as to produce a result which is, in effect, wholly new. All this raises so many juristic problems, however, that it seems essential to provide a certain amount of historical background, well-known although much of the material will necessarily be.

In the orthodox Muslim view the golden period of Muslim law, from the point of view of its purity and enforcement, was that of the four Rightly-Guided Caliphs. Under their rule the Sharī'a is believed to have been fully and exclusively the law of the State. It was based on the divine revelation of the Qur'ān; on the prophetic precedent of what Muḥammad had said, done and allowed; and, where necessary, on the considered judgment (or opinion) of the Companions of the Prophet, often given in a semi-collective form. From the advent of the Umayyad dynasty, however, things began to deteriorate. The pious largely withdrew from an impious government and worked out their theories in comparative seclusion, while the Government permitted local custom and even human edicts to be enforced by the Courts alongside, or even in substitution for, the Sacred Law. The jurists, for their part, are pictured as largely occupied with the collection and scrutiny of Traditions and with the gradual erection of their systems of law on the basis of the divine texts and of a more or less free use of analogy.

This picture needs considerable revision. It is evident that Muḥammad himself made no attempt to work out any comprehensive legal system, a task for which he seems to have been singularly ill-fitted: instead he contented himself with what went little beyond 'ad hoc' amendments to the existing customary law. For the rest, the customary law was no doubt to continue. Before the Islamic state had become very old, however, the conviction grew that all before Islam had been mere Ignorance. The primary task, then, of the early jurists seems in reality to have been the islamicization of the customary law—whether of the Hijaz, Syria or Iraq—first by expunging or amending all that was out of harmony with the divine Book, with such of the Prophet's teaching and practice as they in fact remembered or, indeed, with what they conceived to be the spirit of the new religion; and later by the device of authenticating by fabricated Traditions the residue of customary law and the results of their endeavours.

This work seems to have gone on in the Hijaz, in Syria and in Iraq along somewhat parallel lines. When, at a later date, distinct schools of law crystallized in these various countries, the differences between them were normally explained either on the basis of a conflict of principle concerning the proper sources of jurisprudence (and the comparative priority and scope of each) or on that of their respective knowledge and acceptance of different Traditions. Again,

however, the facts seem to have been otherwise, for it appears that the divergencies between the schools can be explained much more by differences in local conditions than by any fundamental difference in principle; while the Traditions, the acceptance or rejection of which are alleged to have led them to opposite conclusions, were in most cases probably fabricated by the school concerned to justify conclusions it had already reached.

It was in the apparent revival of religion and the Sacred Law which characterised the beginning of the ʿAbbasid dynasty that distinct schools of law appeared in the different countries. The school which prevailed in Iraq came to be primarily associated with the name of Abū Ḥanīfa; that which at first held away in Syria was attributed to al-Awzāʿī; whilst that of the Hijaz came to adopt Mālik bin Anas as its traditional founder. Originally, however, these schools were regularly referred to as the "people of al-Iraq" and the "people of al-Hijaz," etc.; although in the former the rival schools of Sufyān al-Thawrī and Abū Thawr also flourished for a time. At a still later date the Ḥanafī school became a synonym among their rivals for speculative jurists who built up their systems primarily on the Qurʾān and a free use of "opinion," while the Mālikīs are claimed as traditionalists. In reality, however, the differences between the two schools seem almost entirely due to the fact that in the milieu and circumstances of al-Madina Traditions of the Prophet's behavior, whether true or false, were particularly applicable, in marked contrast to the totally different social conditions of Iraq. In case of need, moreover, Mālik apparently felt perfectly free to resort to "opinion"; and his use in such cases of the principle of *istiṣlāḥ* (or the rule which the public interest requires) as a source of law does not differ very widely from the Ḥanafī principle of *istiḥsān* (or the rule which 'seems preferable') as an alternative to the conclusions which would be reached by formal analogy.

The view steadily gained ground in some quarters, however, that the divine law could not be built up on any such human or subjective principles but must be firmly founded, in every instance, on divine revelation. It was just at this juncture that al-Shāfiʿī appeared; and the school which is named after him owes its origin entirely to his personality and influence. His great contribution was to the science of Islamic jurisprudence, for he was the first systematically to define its sources and their scope. It was as a result of his influence that all the four schools which survived came to accept the Qurʾān, the Sunna or practice of the Prophet as enshrined in the Tradition, the *ijmāʿ* or agreement of the Muslim community, and *qiyās* or the extension of these three by analogy, as the primary sources of the sacred law. The Ḥanafī principle of *istiḥsān* he utterly rejected, but he was less

drastic with the Mālikī *istiṣlāḥ*; in addition, moreover, it was his school that gave the fullest development to the principle of *istiṣḥāb* ('seeking a link') by which a condition known to have once existed is regarded as still obtaining in the absence of evidence to the contrary. To the doctrine of *ijmā'* we must presently return.

But al-Shāfi'ī was not extreme enough for some traditionalists, who increasingly insisted on divine authority for every rule. In the event another school was formed by the great traditionalist Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal (himself a Shāfi'ī) who made as few concessions to analogy as possible and accepted, instead, a mass of Traditions which, even according to Muslim principles of criticism, were of doubtful antecedents. A still more extreme school was founded by Dā'ūd al-Zāhirī, so called because he insisted on a strictly literal interpretation of every text, who attempted to dispense with *qiyās* entirely but was forced, by the inexorable law that the unlimited cannot be contained in the limited, to reach much the same results by seeking and applying what he termed the "meaning" (*mafhūm*) of the text.

In time all the schools came to be classified as traditionalists except the Ḥanafīs, who were regarded as the champions of speculation. Stories were even invented of how Mālik bitterly repented on his death bed of the freedom of judgment he had sometimes allowed himself. We have already noted, however, that the differences in principle between some of the schools have been greatly exaggerated and that the considerable divergence between them in matters of detail can largely be attributed to other causes. In the final event, moreover, the Syrian school of al-Awzā'ī, and the rival schools of Sufyān al-Thawrī and Abū Thawr in Iraq, became extinct; as did also a school founded by the famous Qur'ān commentator al-Ṭabarī and, eventually, even the Zāhirīs themselves. With the passage of time, therefore, the "people of the Sunna and the Jamā'a," as the Sunnis called themselves, came to regard only four schools—the Ḥanafīs, Mālikīs, Shāfi'īs and the Ḥanbalīs—as representing the scope of legitimate difference covered by the spurious Tradition: "The disagreement of my people is a mercy from God." And it is precisely the mercy which these differences represent which the modern eclectic legislation seeks to exploit.

In addition, however, to the jurists mentioned above a number of other names are quoted as authorities in the Explanatory Memoranda which often accompany the new legislation or in the text books which discuss the juristic basis of its various provisions. These include several of the Companions, such as the first four Caliphs, Ibn Mas'ūd, Ibn 'Abbās, Ibn 'Umar, Zayd bin Thābit, and 'Abdul Raḥmān bin 'Awf; a considerable number of the next generation,

such as Sa'īd bin al-Musayyib, 'Urwa bin al-Zubayr, Shurayḥ, Muḥammad bin Ishāq, 'Ikrima, 'Aṭa', 'Alqama, al-Sha'ebī, al-Zuhri and Ṭāwus; and several other very early jurists such as Layth bin Sa'd, Ibn Abī Layla, Ibn Shubruma, Abū Bakr al-Aṣamm, 'Uthmān al-Baṭṭī and al-Ḥakam bin 'Uṭayba, etc., jurists whose alleged opinions have mostly come down to us only in the form of brief quotations or summaries in the works of later writers. The leading disciples of the founders of the four schools are also sometimes quoted as authorities, especially the Ḥanafis Abū Yūsuf, Muḥammad al-Shaybānī, Zufar and al-Ḥasan bin Ziyād. Among later jurists those singled out for reference are chiefly Ibn Ḥazm the Zāhirī and the two highly independent Ḥanbali reformers Ibn Taymīya and his disciple Ibn al-Qayyim. The controversy which has raged concerning the legitimacy of such quotation will be discussed below.

Schools of law were, however, by no means limited to the orthodox. More than one of the early Imams of the Shī'a were notable jurists, and each of the main sub-sects of the Shī'a in course of time formed its own school of law. Nearest in outlook to the Sunnīs comes the Zaydī sect, whose school of *fiqh* traditionally goes back to the Zayd bin Zayn al-Ābidīn who gives them their name: to him a still extant complete compendium of law is attributed—but this, at least in its present form, must really be of somewhat later date. The school of the "Twelvers" of Persia, Iraq, India etc., is commonly called the Ja'farī school after their sixth Imām, Ja'far al-Ṣāriq, another notable jurist. Like the Sunnīs they find the primary sources of law in the Qur'ān and the Traditions, although they confine themselves to their own collections of the latter: in addition the majority of them, the Uṣūlīs, accept the authoritative deductions of their leading jurists (the *mujtahids*) since the disappearance of their Twelfth Imām, for such deductions are regarded as inspired by this infallible Teacher; but a smaller party, the Akhbārīs, rival the Zāhirīs in their eschewment of all that is not strictly traditional. In effect both the Zaydīs and Ja'farīs differ from the four Sunnī law schools little more than the latter differ among themselves, except, of course, in all that concerns the Imamate. But the orthodox Sunni attitude would for centuries past have made such reference to—and even borrowing from—these rival systems as the new legislation and its Explanatory Memoranda not infrequently include, a stark impossibility.

While, however, the modern attitude brings the Ja'farīs and Zaydīs within the pale of quotable authorities, this is not yet true of the Ismā'ilīs and the 'Ibāḍīs. The former are, of course, extremists in some points of doctrine, but in law their differences from the Sunnīs are scarcely more marked than those of the schools we have already

considered.¹ The same can also be said of the law of the 'Ibādīs of North Africa, 'Uman and East Africa, who also accept the Qur'ān and Sunna as their primary sources, but still allow their leading jurists to exercise "Opinion" and reject the *ijmā'* of the orthodox (who equally, of course, exclude them from its scope). The modern legislation in Egypt actually includes one provision borrowed from this school, but strictly without acknowledgment.

Unlike the Ja'farīs, who still accord their leading jurists some right of independent deduction from the primary sources of the law, the Sunnīs came to believe that this right (*ijtihād*) has been progressively limited since the end of the third century of the Muslim era. This was partly due to a feeling that successive generations of lawyers were not the equals of their illustrious predecessors who founded the great schools, the more so since the nearer a man stood to the Prophet and his Companions the more likely he was to understand the context, meaning, and application of the sacred texts. Again, it was partly the result of the crystallization of the rival schools, the party spirit of their adherents, and the fact that most of the logical possibilities within the limits of the divine texts had already been exhausted, so that later jurists had much to choose from but little to add, unless they were to engage in fanciful and eccentric interpretations. Yet again, it was partly due to the widening scope of *ijmā'*, which was regarded as putting the imprimatur of divine authority and immutability on much for which no wholly conclusive text could be quoted. As a result jurists were confined to a more and more sterile *taqlīd* or acceptance of the views and decisions of their predecessors (and particularly of the founders of the schools and their more immediate followers) without the right of weighing the evidence and preferring some deduction of their own.

Originally, of course, the principle of *ijtihād* and *taqlīd* was reasonable enough. If a man was qualified to exercise the faculty of independent deduction all agreed that he might and most insisted that he must. It was only if he was not so qualified that he must ask the opinion of one who was. All except the Mu'tazila, moreover, agreed that a *mujtahid* was liable to error; but where the evidences were obscure and he exerted himself to the utmost he was in any case entitled to a reward, which would be doubled if the result he reached was, in fact, correct. To one not so qualified the pronouncement of a *mujtahid* took the place of a *dalīl* (indication) of the Lawgiver; he was blameless if he acted upon it, even if faulty, but he could always seek another opinion.

Later, however, party spirit within the schools grew progressively

¹ In some respects actually less so, except of course where those who were converted from Hinduism retained Hindu customary law in some particulars.

stronger, and the free scope even of *taqlīd* was correspondingly curtailed. Some later Ḥanafīs went so far as to say that one who was born a Ḥanafī must live and die a Ḥanafī, and any deviation from his school deserved punishment. Other jurists allowed a man to change his school in toto but not to follow one school in one particular and another in another: he might decide which of the great Imāms was most worthy of his allegiance, but he was not qualified to assess their respective arguments on detailed points of difference and decide which was in each case the most convincing. Yet others, however, insisted on this very point; they held that a man might follow the views of different Imāms in different particulars, but only on condition that he was in each case convinced that the opinion he followed was, in fact, preferable.

Some, however, challenged the competence of a *maqallid* (a follower of *taqlīd*) so to assess the evidence but without thereby condemning him to blind allegiance to a single school in every particular. Instead they allowed him to follow different opinions on different points as best suited his circumstances, on condition only that he did not choose the least exacting provisions of each school. Others, again, made it a condition that he must follow one view exclusively from beginning to end of a single matter; it was forbidden, they said, to follow the opinion of one Imām in one aspect and another in another of what must properly be regarded as a single whole. This was termed *talfīq*, and must engage our attention more fully later. Yet others, however, chiefly confined themselves to insisting that a man's motive in picking and choosing between the rules of different jurists must not be to make a mere sport (*lahw*) of the law or to satisfy his every whim and fancy (*al-tashahhi*).

Even so, however, some jurists maintained that the opinion followed must be reliably attributed to a jurist who clearly had the right to exercise *ijtihād* or who was himself merely expounding the accepted views of his school. This argument was (and is) largely used by those who wished to fix the limits of legitimate difference at the views which ultimately prevailed in the four orthodox schools. Admittedly references could be found in many texts to variant views held by certain of the Companions and other early jurists of unquestionable authority, and in principle there could be little objection to the adoption of any such views, unless they were regarded as subsequently nullified by *ijmāʿ*. It was urged, however, that contradictions abounded in the views attributed to these early jurists—and even, for that matter, to the founders of the schools themselves: but while in the latter case such contradictions were elucidated by succeeding generations of their followers, in the former no certainty could exist as to their true opinion; and in any case the number of

reporters of such opinions was normally not such as to induce certainty. As for the opinions of later jurists of independent character, their right to exercise such wide powers of *ijtihād* as they claimed, or to depart from the accepted view of their school, might well be called in question.

Yet again, it was commonly agreed that the freedom of choice outlined above concerned an individual only in his private life. When it came to a question of the guidance or compulsion of others, as in the case of a Muftī or Qāḍī, no such latitude could be allowed. It was frequently emphasised, therefore, that a Muftī or Qāḍī who had not reached the rank of a *mujtahid*—as no latter day jurists were held to have done—was compelled to follow the 'chosen' or 'preferable' view of the school to which he belonged. Only at the command of the Ruler based on the public interests could he adopt a different view.

Even this last point was hotly debated. It was generally admitted that the Ruler might properly restrict the competence of his judges in respect of the locality and duration of their jurisdiction, or even the type of cases each might hear. But it was frequently insisted that if one judge was precluded from hearing certain cases another must be empowered to try them, while if all judges were so precluded the Ruler must hear such cases in person: otherwise, he would be guilty of a denial of justice. Some, again, maintained that he could not legitimately order a judge belonging to one school to apply the principles of another; nor, if he did, might the judge obey him. And while others supported the right of a Ruler to insist on the application of the view of some particular school or jurist, in any matter of dispute, when the public interest so required, precedents for the extension of this principle to cover the introduction of an authoritative and comprehensive code were far to seek.

The whole problem was further complicated by the vexed question of *ijmāʿ*. In its origin this seems to have been a wholly natural principle. After the death of the Prophet questions often arose in which the first two Caliphs were in doubt as to the existence and relevance of any divine text or of the correct rule of law to be applied, and in such cases they frequently put the question to the leading Companions. Where these were at variance the Caliph would give judgment as he saw fit in the particular case in point and his judgment thereon would be accepted; but the point of law would remain at large, and subsequently cases might be differently decided. Where, however, the Companions were unanimously agreed, the question was regarded as settled. Similarly, the general agreement of jurists of the second generation would, in the nature of things, normally be decisive for those of the third. This was probably Abū Ḥanifa's approach to the subject. For Mālik, moreover, the agreement of the

jurists of al-Madina seems to have been decisive; but it is doubtful how far he would have allowed the same principle elsewhere. The doctrine is systematically—although briefly—discussed by al-Shāfiʿī in his *Risāla*, as part of his comprehensive treatment of jurisprudence. In the section he devotes to this subject he first discusses the view of those who, already at that early date, alleged that the community would never have reached such agreement except on the basis of some established Sunna of the Prophet, even if they did not relate it. To this he replied that where it is specifically stated that the point on which they agreed was based on some tradition recorded of the Prophet, this must be accepted: but where this is not related they may in fact have stated it to be so and they may not, so it must not be regarded as actually related from him. In such cases their statement should be accepted on their own authority, since it is certain that the community as a whole would not stray from the Sunna of the Prophet, although some of them might; for the whole community would never agree upon an error. In support of this thesis he quotes several Traditions, especially one about the duty of adhering to the *Jamāʿa* of the Muslims. He concludes his argument in these words; “Whoever holds to the view of the *Jamāʿa* adheres to the *Jamāʿa*, while he who differs from their view breaks away from that *Jamāʿa* to which he has been commanded to adhere. A mistake can only take place in separation, for the *Jamāʿa* collectively can make no mistake regarding the meaning of the Qurʾān, regarding the Sunna or Analogy.”

This passage shows plainly how the doctrine developed. While an individual *mujtahid* might err in his deductions the community as a whole was regarded as divinely preserved from error. Even where a rule was originally based on the Qurʾān or Sunna, therefore, later Shāfiʿīs habitually refer to the subsequent *ijmāʿ* which confirms the interpretation placed on the former and the authenticity of the latter. By this means, then, a Tradition originally reported by a single witness² could be accorded the weight of one reported by a number whose agreement on falsehood was inconceivable.³

The later Ḥanafīs, moreover, developed the doctrine in even greater detail. It was commonly defined as the “agreement of the *mujtahids* of the people of Muḥammad, in any age, in any legal matter”⁴—although almost every word of this definition was challenged and varied by different jurists. Some opined that the agreement of the *mujtahids* must be confirmed by the whole community;⁵

² *Aḥād*.

³ *Tawātur*.

⁴ Ibn Humam, *al-Taḥrīr*, V.3, p. 80.

⁵ cf. al-ʿAmīdī, *al-Aḥkām* V.1, p. 115. Ibn Humam, *al-Taḥrīr* V.3, p. 81.

others that the *ijmā'* of jurists was effective in points of law, and that of theologians in matters of theology—while some even added that of grammarians on points of grammar.⁶ But difficulties abounded, for who could determine how many *mujtahids* there were at any given time, whether all had in fact genuinely agreed, and whether any had subsequently changed their minds (which would destroy the *ijmā'* according to certain authorities)?⁷ It was maintained, therefore, that *ijmā'* might not only be expressed but 'silent'—as where some *mujtahids* had spoken while others, who must be presumed to have been cognisant of the opinion uttered, abstained from any adverse comment. In course of time, moreover, *ijmā'* was more and more freely claimed to silence any variant or inconveniently independent opinion.⁸

In reality, however, there were those who challenged this view from the very first. Thus Ibn Ḥazm alleges that Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal went so far as to say; "That for which a man claims *ijmā'* is a lie, and he who claims it is a liar; for people may have differed . . . without him knowing this. So let him say, 'We do not know of any difference of opinion.'"⁹ Some extremists even denied that *ijmā'*, however certain, was a legitimate source of law;¹⁰ others admitted its validity in theory but denied that its existence could ever be established after the Companions had scattered throughout the Muslim world;¹¹ while others only admitted its certainty in major points of religion (e.g., the five prayers etc.)¹² Thus on one report Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal (like his modern followers, the Wahhābis) accepted only the *ijmā'* of the Companions, as did also the Zāhiris; others rejected the concept of 'silent' *ijmā'*, which enormously limited its scope;¹³ while yet others denied that its existence could in fact be established in most of the instances for which it was claimed.

A variation of this same debate concerns the position where two or more variant views on some given point are known to have been held in the past. Must this be regarded as *ijmā'* that these views exhaust the possibilities and that no other view is possible? Again, may these variant views be combined, or must one or other be adopted in its entirety? This brings us back to the vexed question of *talfiq*. May a man, it is asked, perform his ablutions according to

⁶ cf. al-Shawkānī, *Irshād al-Fuḥūl*, p. 68.

⁷ This view is attributed, e.g., to Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal and Abū Bakr Fawrak.

⁸ It was urged, e.g., that a few dissentient voices would not destroy the *ijmā'* of the vast majority.

⁹ Ibn Ḥazm. *al-Aḥkām*, V.4, p. 188.

¹⁰ e.g. some of the Shī'a, of the Khawārij, and of the Mu'tazila.

¹¹ Partly on the grounds that it could not, in the nature of things, be reported by a number sufficient to induce certainty.

¹² Where its report would indeed reach this number (*tawātur*).

¹³ One report from al-Shāfi'ī himself is to this effect.

the Shāfi'ī prescriptions, then adopt the Mālikī view that to touch a woman without lust does not nullify them, and finally proceed to pray according to the Shāfi'ī or Ḥanafī ritual? Here the question largely turns on whether ablution and the prayer for which it prepares must be regarded as an indivisible whole. A yet more extreme instance would be provided by the marriage of a major girl acting without the intervention of a guardian, without any dowry being mentioned, and without any witnesses to the actual contract (although the marriage was made public in other ways.) Could such a marriage be regarded as valid on the grounds that the Ḥanafis do not insist in such cases on the intervention of a guardian or the mention of dowry, while the Mālikīs do not insist on the presence of witnesses to the contract? Here even the most liberal usually reply in the negative, as no single jurist would have considered such a marriage valid and it is manifestly impossible to regard it as other than an indivisible whole.

The framers and supporters of the new legislation have taken a decisive stand regarding some of these points around which controversy has raged, while concerning others they have been much more cautious. Thus the whole movement of reform rests unequivocally on the assertion that the Ruler (or, in a modern State, the Legislature) may restrict the jurisdiction of the Courts not only with regard to locality etc., but also concerning what cases may be heard and which of any variant views must be applied. This has been held to justify even a general denial of judicial relief in certain circumstances—e.g., where no documentary evidence is available, or after a certain lapse of time—and the introduction, by statutory enactment, of comprehensive codes of Shari'ā precepts drawn from the wide range of variant opinions provided by the controversies of the past.

But in spite of the insistence of both the Wāḥhābis and the modernists that the door of *ijtihād* has in principle never been closed—supported, in the case of the latter, by the argument that the recent increase in the publication and distribution of authoritative texts and commentaries has actually put the contemporary scholar in a better position to exercise this faculty than the giants of the past ever were—no claim to this right has in fact been made by the Committees which drew up the legislation hitherto promulgated. This is not to say, of course, that they have never in fact exercised this faculty, at least to some degree; or indeed, that they see any objection in principle to so doing. On the contrary, it appears rather that they have avoided any such claim in order to reassure the more conservative or hesitant elements among the public. Instead they maintain that they have done no more than to choose between the variant opinions of reputable jurists, although they admit that they have based their choice not on the consideration of which of these views

have the best juristic support but purely and simply on the question of which are more suited to modern needs.

As for *talfiq* (of which shocking instances are alleged by their opponents and happy examples claimed by some of their supporters) they often maintain that even this word is not really applicable to their work. True, they have frequently combined the views of several jurists in a single article—views which sometimes rest on mutually contradictory premises—yet each is to be applied in different sets of circumstances. While, therefore, it may be true that no single jurist would have supported the article as a whole, no such instances as that of a marriage without guardian, dowry or witnesses (as noted above) can, they maintain, be found among the provisions of the new legislation. This again, however, appears a very open question.

When we turn to the doctrine of *ijmā'*, many instances can be found in the new legislation which traverse the accepted views of all four orthodox schools—views for which the authority of consensus had regularly been claimed. Some modern Muslims actually go so far as to reject as spurious the Traditions which affirm the infallibility of the community of Muḥammad and frankly admit that this community has sometimes been at fault. The more common attitude, however, is simply to deny that in relevant instances any true *ijmā'* ever existed; for such, it is maintained, must be both unanimous and expressed. And on such a basis any *ijmā'* later than that of the Companions before they scattered from al-Madina is a virtual impossibility.

All this, of course, concerns only matters in which the exercise of *ijtihād* is, or has been, legitimate. Where a divine text exists, whether from the Qur'ān or the Ḥadīth, the case is otherwise, and in theory the Muslim has only to obey. In reality, however, the matter is neither so simple nor so rigid as this, for several possibilities remain. The text concerned may conceivably have been abrogated; it may be susceptible to interpretation; and, in the case of a Tradition, it may be dismissed as spurious. It is just for this reason that the authority of *ijmā'* is frequently claimed to support the accepted interpretation of a Quranic text or the authenticity of a Tradition whose antecedents might otherwise be questioned. But the authority of *ijmā'*, as we have seen, has today been seriously undermined.

Yet other possibilities, however, also exist. It is frequently a matter of dispute, for instance, as to whether an expression in the sacred texts should be regarded as actually forbidding or commanding some action or merely as deprecating or commending it; or, again, whether an express command or prohibition is intended to be binding only on the individual conscience before the bar of eternity or enforceable by the State before the Courts. Yet again, some jurists

admit that even a divine text which is based on custom may be differently applied if the custom changes; others confess that necessity virtually knows no laws; while yet others distinguish matters in which nothing but blind obedience¹⁴ is in place from those in which the divine law is held to be based on the welfare of humanity and each prescription both understandable and—possibly—capable of variation according to changing needs. While those who frankly admit the more extreme of these propositions are still comparatively rare, it will readily be seen that the limits within which reform is possible are tolerably wide.

Most of the principles outlined above may be observed in action in any detailed examination of the recent legislation, whether promulgated or proposed. Instances will be noted in succeeding articles.

J. N. D. ANDERSON

London, England

¹⁴ *ta'abbud*.

THE QUR'ĀN AS SCRIPTURE IV

It is not infrequently urged against Western scholarship that in its investigation of Muḥammad and his message it concerns itself too closely with tracing the origins of the various elements which enter into that teaching, and does not sufficiently consider what Muḥammad himself made of the material he had at his disposal as he moulded it for the service of his mission and for the use of his community after him. Shakespeare often enough took over plots from stories more or less familiar to his audiences, even themes which had already been used by his predecessors in the dramatic art, but the dramas that have become part of world literature are the fruit of Shakespeare's own handling of that material. It is doubtless true that Shakespeare had read Francis de Belleforest's version of the Hamlet story from the *Historia Danica* of Saxo Grammaticus, and he may have seen, perhaps even have acted in, the play about Hamlet which was popular in London in his youth. Yet the *Hamlet* we know and admire is what Shakespeare made out of the earlier material he found to his hand. So in discussing the Qur'ān as Scripture it is not enough to show that Muḥammad took over from his contemporaries a particular theory of the nature of Scripture, and one particular form of the doctrine of a prophetic order with which Scripture revelation was associated, as well as a concept of the mechanism of revelation whereby Scripture was made available to mankind, we must ask what Muḥammad did with all this as he built Scripture into the religion of the community he was organizing in Arabia.

It is necessary to insist again that it was a religious mission which Muḥammad came forward to undertake among his people, the Arabs. We must regard him as quite as sincerely convinced of his "call" to this mission as Martin Luther and John Wesley were to theirs, and as fully prepared as they were to give his all to the carrying through of his mission. Like them, however, he was a child of his age and environment, who thought and planned the details concerned with the working out of his mission in terms of the religious life of his contemporary world. Part of contemporary life in the more advanced religious communities of his day was the use of Scripture, and so part of what he was to do for his religious community was to provide them with a Scripture. This Scripture is in our hands as the Qur'ān. What we have may not be precisely what he would have wished to leave with his community as the *Kitāb*, for he died before he had issued it as an authoritative collection, and we cannot be absolutely sure that what his successors gathered together and issued after his death was just what he would have wished it to be. Orthodox theory insists that it is, and in any case it is all that we have as his *Kitāb*, so to it we must look for the answers to our final questions.

The first of them is—how does Muḥammad relate his Scripture to the earlier Scriptures which were in the hands of his contemporaries?

He claims that what he has proclaimed was “sent down” as a message to his contemporaries, just as earlier Scripture was “sent down” to earlier peoples (XXI.10; VI.114; II.23/21,89/83ff.; V.66/70). It is intended to give his Arab contemporaries the substance of what had been given these earlier communities in their Scriptures, so he declares that its message is substantially what was in the earlier Books (LXXXVII.18,19; XLII.13/11; XXVI.196; IV.26/31). It is thus a confirmation of them (XII.111; X.37/38; VI.92; XXXV.31/28; IV.47/50), and their safe-guard (V.48/52). Therefore it is explicitly put on the same level as the *Torah* and the *Injīl* (IX.111/112), and the members of his community are instructed that they must believe in the earlier Scripture revelations as well as in what has been “sent down” to Muḥammad (II.4/3,89/83ff.,136/130; III.84/78; IV.60/63,136/135,162/160; V.59/64).

If this were all, we could say that the relation of the Qur’ān to other Scriptures was that it was an Arabic version of the message already given in them. The claim for it, however, goes further than this, for we find it stated that its message is intended to make clear what had been sent down to previous messengers (XVI.44/46,64/66; X.37/38), clearing up for the people of the earlier religious communities those matters about which they differ (XXVII.76/78; III.23/22). This is practically a claim to supersede previous Scripture, and Muḥammad says that the people of knowledge among those earlier communities recognize in his message the promise of their Lord (XVII.108).

What promise of their Lord? Obviously Muḥammad must have learned that in their Scriptures there was some promise which he could interpret his mission as fulfilling. But how had he learned such a thing as this? Certain things in our previous discussion may have suggested that perhaps Muḥammad’s closer contact was with Scripture in the hands of Christians, but careful examination of the matter makes it quite plain that the Book with which he had most contact was that in the possession of his Jewish contemporaries. He had seen that book in their hands (V.43/47), knew that they studied it (VII.169/168; II.76/71), and heard it recited (II.44/41). He also knew that they were accustomed to write the *Torah* on parchment (VI.91; II.79/73). Quite possibly it was in his earlier days that he first saw Scripture in the hands of the *Ahl al-Kitāb*, for in early passages of the Qur’ān he refers to Scripture as something in *ṣuḥuf* (LXXX.13; LXXIV.52; LXXXVII.18,19; LIII.36/37; XCVIII.2). That Scripture is for him always something written out (XXIX.

48/47; XXXIV.44/43; VI.155/156; LII.2,3) would fit with either the Jewish or the Christian Holy Book, but the *ṣuḥuf* rather suggests Jewish scrolls. It is also significant that he refers more particularly to the *Torah* as that which preceded his own revelation (XI.17/20; XLVI.12/11; II.41/38; III.3/2), and to his teaching as the confirmation in Arabic of the *Torah* (XLVI.12/11; II.41/38,89/83).

Now it is evident that he was anxious to gain a closer acquaintance with this Book of the Jewish community, but was thwarted by some of their leaders. He complains that they show the parchments but conceal much (VI.91), so he challenges them to bring out the Book and read it (III.93/87). That he had learned something of the legal prescriptions of their Law appears from the statement in VI.118,119 about slaughtering for food, and he could hardly have ventured the statement that when their learned men hear the message he is setting forth in his preaching they recognize it (XXVI.197; cf. IV.162/160; XLVI.10/9), unless he knew well that he was reproducing something he had learned from their Book. It is possible that at first the Jewish leaders welcomed his inquiries about their Scriptures, and became uncooperative only when they discovered the import of his own claims to be in the prophet succession.¹

Sūra II.76/71 makes it plain that some of them objected to Muḥammad and his followers being told what was in their Scriptures, but apparently he persisted in his attempts. He knows that among them are unlearned folk from whom it is useless to seek information since they know nothing of Scripture but its stories (II.78/73). What is most curious is that he seems to have attempted to purchase from some of the Jews transcripts of matter from their Scripture, only to find after they had taken the money that they had deceived him. V.44/48, which is dealing with the *Torah*, reprobates the selling of Allah's verses for a small price, and this is explained by II.79/73:

"Woe to those who write out Scripture with their hands, and say: 'This is from Allah,' that they may buy with it some small gain. Woe to them for what their hands have written, and woe to them for the gain they make."²

In Madinan passages there are several references to the tampering with Scripture.

III.78/72: "Among them is a group who torture Scripture with their tongues that ye may suppose it to be from Scripture, though it is not from the Scriptures. They say: 'It is from Allah,' though it is not from Allah. They utter a lie against Allah, and know that they are so doing."

¹ cf. II.90/84 which states that they were envious that Allah should have sent down His grace to Muḥammad; and II.109/103 which suggests that in their envy they tried to win back some of his converts.

² Bell in his note on this passage suggests that it refers to the oral Law which the Jews wished to place on the same level as Scripture. That, however, hardly fits the words indicating some gain made by selling what they had written. This gain is referred to again in III.187/184.

- V.13/16: "they change the words from their places, and have forgotten part of that of which they were reminded.³ Thou wilt not cease to come upon treachery on their part, save a few among them, but pardon them, and overlook it."
- V.41/45: "they change the words from their places, and say: 'If ye are given this, accept it, but if ye are not given it, beware.' . . . These are they whose hearts Allah desires not to purify."
- II.75/70: "there was a group of them who would hear the word of Allah, then they would change it, after they had understood it, and would do this knowingly."
- IV.44/47ff.: "Hast thou not seen those who were given a portion of the Scripture purchasing error and desiring that ye should err from the way? Allah well knows your enemies, and Allah suffices as a patron, Allah suffices as a helper. Some among those who profess Judaism change the words from their places, and say: 'We hear and we rebel,' and 'Hear' something that is not audible, and 'Shepherd us'—torturing (it) with their tongues, and violating religion. Had they said, 'We hear and we obey,' and 'hear' and 'regard us,' it had been better for them and more correct, but Allah has cursed them with their unbelief."⁴

The key words to the understanding of these passages are *ḥarrafa* "to change," and *lawā* "to torture." Each radical in the root of a Semitic word is a *ḥarf*, and to make play with these radicals in a word would be to do what is meant by *ḥarrafa*. Thus to change an 'ain to a *ghain* would change *ba'al*, a husband, into *baghl*, a mule, or by metathesis *kallama*, "he spoke," might become *kammala* "he completed." *Lawā* is properly "to twist," so that to twist a thing with the tongue

³ i.e. they forget that there are injunctions forbidding such tampering with Scripture.

⁴ These seem to be three examples of what he means by making changes in the text, with what he regarded as the correct text in the latter part of the verse. The first of them *sami'nā wa 'aṣainā* is given in II.93/87 as what the Children of Israel said when the covenant was made with them at Sinai, and in that passage Muḥammad interprets the episode of the golden calf as their punishment for having said "We hear and disobey," when they should have said "We hear and obey." He later learned that these latter words are what they actually did say, and speaks of it with approval (V.7/10; IV.46/49), as it was the phrase he recommended members of his community to use (XXIV.51/50; cf. II.285). Thus it would seem that when he first learned the phrase from the Jews his informants deliberately misled him as to the words "we will do and be obedient" in Ex. XXIV.7, a deception about which he afterwards found out. The second *wasma' ghaira musma'in* Bell takes to be a reference to the *Shema'* which the Jews around him pronounced so indistinctly that he could not catch it. Possibly all three words are what they said, i.e., when he wanted to learn the *Shema'* they would commence correctly with the "Hear," but then instead of completing it as he expected, they would make it run: "Hear!—what you are not going to hear." The third *rā'inā* is mentioned also in II.104/98, where he urges them to say *unẓurnā* instead of *rā'inā*. It apparently refers to some passage containing "behold," "look," "regard" or some such word in Hebrew, which instead of translating by *ra'a* = *naẓara*, they perverted into *ra'a* with an 'ain, which gave the wrong meaning. So he chides them that they did not use the verb *naẓara* when rendering it into Arabic so that he would have understood it properly. A different explanation of these passages is given by J. Obermann in an article "Koran and Agada" in *AJSL*, LVIII, (1941), pp. 23-48.

would mean much the same thing as *ḥarrafa*. It would thus seem that all these passages refer to Muḥammad's contact with Jewish contemporaries who knew the Scriptures, presumably in Hebrew, and translated portions for him into Arabic,⁵ but wittingly altered words so as to deceive him. We have already noted passages which show that certain groups among the *Ahl al-Kitāb* resented Muḥammad's claim to have a revelation, and the continuation of II.75/70 actually shows us the change from friendliness to opposition, and anger that some among them still continued to tell him about their Scripture.

II.76/71: "When they meet those who have believed (i.e., the followers of Muḥammad) they say: 'We (too) have believed'; but when they get alone with one another they say: 'Do ye converse with them about what God hath revealed to you, that they may dispute with you before your Lord? Have ye no sense?'

77/72: Know they not that Allah knows what they keep secret as well as what they let out?"

The Prophet's Arab opponents knew of these attempts to learn about Scripture from the *Ahl al-Kitāb*. Not content with asserting that the substance of his message was but a rehash of the "tales of the ancients" (LXXXIII.13; LXVIII.15; XLVI.17/16; XXVII.68/70; XXIII.83/85; XVI.24/26; VIII.31; VI.25), they even claimed to know that his message was only a devising of his in which others helped him, for he used to have copied down these "tales of the ancients," sometimes in the morning, sometimes in the evening, as they were recited to him (XXV.4/5,5/6). To this his only reply is that One who knows what is secret in heaven and on earth has sent it down (XXV.6/7).⁶ Then when they charge that they know he is taught by a human (XVI.103/105), his reply is that the language of the person to whom they are referring is foreign whereas his message is in plain Arabic speech.⁷

In any case it is obvious that Muḥammad did learn a good deal about the great characters of Scripture, Adam, Noah, Abraham, Moses and Aaron, David and Solomon, Jesus and John Baptist, as well

⁵ There is a well-known tradition, which al-Baidāwī quotes in his comment on III.23/22, relating how Muḥammad used to visit the Jewish Beth Hammidrash, and one may assume that in his day they were accustomed to do as they did in 'Umar's day, read their Scriptures in Hebrew and give the meaning in Arabic. See the *Ṣaḥīḥ* of al-Bukhārī III.198.

⁶ This is the same kind of answer as was made by the founder of the Mormons when his unfriendly critics pointed out that the speeches of Nephi in his Book contained quotations from the Westminster Catechism.

⁷ Tradition has preserved the names of a number of foreigners with whom Muḥammad was said to have been in contact in Mecca, any one of whom may have been the person referred to in the verse. Aṭ-Ṭabarī assembles these traditions in his Commentary on this verse, and the various references to them are given in the volume *From the Pyramids to Paul*, New York, 1935, pp. 98-100.

as certain elements of the religious teaching of both the Jews and the Christians. The fact that what he learned of these revered characters came more often from uncanonical than from canonical sources, and that certain elements in the teachings of these religions were sadly misunderstood, is of less moment to our discussion than the fact that this material is incorporated in his Scripture as revelation given to him in continuation and confirmation of previous Scripture. It must have been evident to any in his audience who had close acquaintance with the Old or the New Testament that his accounts of Biblical matters were far from accurate. There is evidence, indeed, in the *Sira* that on more than one occasion certain Jews in his audience made merry over his ignorance of Biblical matters. How then was he to justify his Scripture against them?

Could we answer that question fully we should have our final answer as to his doctrine of Scripture. Perhaps we can answer it in part, for we have a hint of the answer in the passage already mentioned where Muḥammad says that the people of knowledge among these other communities recognize in his message the promise of their Lord (XVII.108). But what promise of their Lord?

Muḥammad knows that the Jews disputed among themselves about the Book, and were in doubt and questioning (XLI.45; XI.110/112; X.93; XLV.17/16). He knows also that they and the Christians differed about Scriptural matters (II.113/107), so that on the Day of Resurrection Allah will have to decide between them on these matters. But if Scripture is really the same message revealed from the archetypal Book through the succession of prophets whom Allah sent, why should there be these questionings and doubts and disputes? Surely the only answer is that men have corrupted the message of the prophets. It will be remembered that this was the charge preferred against the Jews in earlier days by the Ebionites,⁸ those Judaeo-Christians whose communities to the east of the Jordan seem to have been still active even later than the Vth century, and to whose teachings the Qur'ān presents at times such close resemblances. Their charge was that "false pericopes" had been introduced into the Old Testament in order to validate later Jewish teaching and practice,⁹ so that only by the removal of these "corruptions" could the teachings of the original revelation be recovered. According to the Ebionites it was the function of that angelic being whom they called the True Prophet, to care for the revelation of this original faith. This being was very closely associated with Adam, appeared as the bearer of rev-

⁸ This has been recently discussed again by H. J. Schoeps in his *Aus frühchristlicher Zeit*, Tübingen, 1950, p. 88.

⁹ See on this Schoeps, *Theologie und Geschichte des Judenchristentums*, Tübingen, 1949, pp. 148-176.

elation to both Abraham and Moses, and was in a way incarnated in Jesus.¹⁰ Now in Deut. XVIII.15 is the promise by Moses:

"A prophet will the Lord thy God raise up unto thee from the midst of thee, from thy brethren, like unto me. To him shall ye hearken."

and in Jno.XIV.26 is the promise by Jesus:

"But the Paraclete, which is the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things."

In LXI.6 we have the well-known passage where Muḥammad identifies himself with the promised Paraclete, so that in VII.157/156 we could well see his identification of himself with the promised prophet of Deuteronomy. This then would be the "promise of their Lord" which they should have recognized. If so it could well be the point of his chiding them for concealing the truth when they know it (III.71/64; cf.II.42/39.44/41).

Possibly some contact with Ebionite teaching in North Arabia gave the pattern for Muḥammad's thought in this connection. The prophetic succession from Adam to Jesus and then to himself, with its curious emphasis on the names of Adam, Noah, Abraham, the Tribes and Moses in the succession,¹¹ the angelic figure associated with the transmission of revelation whom he equates with Gabriel and the Holy Spirit, the emphasis on the "heavenly book," the docetic Christology, and the charge of corrupting Scripture, all point in this direction.¹² His own interpretation of the promise, however, would seem to be original,¹³ and is for us the important thing, for it gave a ground on which he might base his claim that his Scripture was the final revelation.

The Scriptures known to his contemporaries were in the hands of the Jews and the Christians. Though the Jews followed the revelation as it had been delivered to Moses in the *Torah*, and the Christians that delivered to Jesus in the *Injil*, both Jews and Christians claimed to have Abraham as their father.¹⁴ Yet as he came in contact with these groups in his milieu he found that—

¹⁰ See Schoeps, *Aus frühchristlicher Zeit*, pp. 32, 33.

¹¹ In later Muslim writings Adam, Noah, Abraham and Moses are associated with Jesus and Muḥammad as a special group set apart among the prophets and distinguished by the title *ulū'l-'azm*.

¹² These connections were pointed out by A. Schlatter in a paper, "Die Entwicklung des jüdischen Christentums zum Islam," in *Evang. Miss. Mag.* for 1918, pp. 251-264, and have had attention called to them more recently by H. J. Schoeps in a section "Ebionitische Elemente im Islam" in his *Theol. u. Gesch.* pp. 334-342.

¹³ K. Ahrens, *Muhammad als Religionsstifter*, p. 186, thinks we can see how Muḥammad from what he learned of Jewish and Christian teaching was led to fix his attention on Abraham whose religion was anterior to both.

¹⁴ cf. Matt. III.9; Jon.VIII.33-39 (with Strack-Billerbeck's *Kommentar*, I.116 ff.); Gal.III.29. it is noteworthy that the writer of the genealogy of Jesus in Matt. I.1 begins his line of descent of Jesus as Saviour with Abraham.

"The Jews say: 'The Christians have no foundation,' and the Christians say: 'The Jews have no foundation,' though both read the Book". (II.113/107)

and in particular they disputed about Abraham (III.65/58). Consequently he went back to this Abraham from whom both Jews and Christians derived, but from whose teaching both must manifestly have departed, and interprets his religion as a restoration of the "faith of Abraham." The steps of the argument are plain—

- 1) The gift of Scripture as a revelation of "the way of Allah" was a gift peculiarly associated with the family of Abraham (XXIX.27/26; cf. LVII. 26; IV.54/57).
- 2) The message given by revelation to Muḥammad is that he follow the religion (*milla*) of Abraham (XVI.123/124; III.95/89; cf. IV.125/124; III.68/61; VI.161/162).
- 3) This religion of Abraham was what had already been given to Noah (XLII.13/11; XXXVII.83/81), and was later given to Moses and Jesus (XLII.13/11; cf. LVII.27).
- 4) It was revealed again to Muḥammad, whose message is thus essentially that revealed to these earlier prophets and founders of communities (LIII.36/37,37/38; LXXXVII.18,19).
- 5) This Abrahamic faith is the "right religion" (*dīn qiyam*, VI.161/162), since Abraham was a *Ḥanīf* (VI.161/162; II.135/129; III.67/60,95/89; XVI.120/121,123/124), was a Muslim (III.67/60; cf. XXII.78/77), and was in particular distinguished as not being "one of the associators" (VI.161/162; III.67/60,95/89; XVI.120/121,123/124; II.135/129). For this reason Allah made him a model (*imām*) of right religion to guide others (II.124/118), so that none but the debased of soul would mislike this faith of Abraham (II.130/124).
- 6) This religion Abraham bequeathed to his descendants (II.132/126), promising that those who followed him should be of him (XIV.36/39). The Jews and Christians of Muḥammad's day, however, who disputed about Abraham (III.65/58) have clearly departed from that original faith, so that Muḥammad can declare that it is something different from the religion of contemporary Jews and Christians (II.135/129; III.67/60).
- 7) Abraham had foreseen this defection of later days and had prayed that an Apostle might be raised up from his people to rehearse Allah's signs to them, teach them Scripture, and purify them (II.129/123).

That prayer had now been answered in the coming of Muḥammad. He was raised up from among the Arabs whom the Jews recognized to be of the descendants of the Patriarch through Ishmael

(*Baba mezi'a* 86b). He was sent to rehearse Allah's signs (II.151/146; LXII.2; III.164/158; LXV.11), to purify them (II.151/146; III.164/158; LXII.2), and to instruct them in Scripture and wisdom (*idem*, and see LIV.5; XVII.39/41), that wisdom (*hikma*) which is especially associated with the line of Abraham (IV.54/57). Therefore his community is the true succession to the *umma* of Abraham, walking in that "straight path" (*aṣ-ṣirāṭ al-mustaqīm*) into which Allah had guided Abraham (XVI.121/122). It is they who are the "Ḥanīfs to Allah" (XXII.31/32), the true Muslims, to whom the greatest of all sins is that of "association" (*shirk*), for it is this faith of Abraham which is laid upon Muḥammad's followers (XXII.78/77), who are to find in him and in those who followed him their finest example (LX.4,6).

"O People of the Book, why dispute ye about Abraham, seeing that neither the Torah nor the Injil were sent down till after him? Have ye no intelligence? Behold ye are they who have been disputing about a matter whereof ye have no knowledge. So why do ye dispute about a matter concerning which ye have no knowledge? Allah knows, but ye do not know. Abraham was not a Jew, and he was not a Christian, but he was a Ḥanīf, a Muslim, and was not one of the associators. The nearest people to Abraham are surely those who have followed him, and this Prophet and those who believe" (III.65/58 ff.).

One consequence of this position was that Abraham had now to be brought into association with the developing cultus of Muḥammad's religion, and this was secured by linking his story to that of the ancient shrine at Mecca which Muḥammad, after his breach with the Jews and the Christians, had made the cult center for his community.¹⁵ In a fairly early Madinan passage which was later worked over (XIV.35/38ff.) we find Abraham represented as praying that "this land" be kept secure, and that he and his sons be kept free from idolatry, after which prayer he states that he has caused some of his descendants to settle in the valley of the Sacred House. In XXII.26/27 it is Allah who makes the site of the Sacred House habitable for Abraham, bids him purify it and prepare it for the pilgrimage rites and then summon folk to the pilgrimage. In II.125/119ff. Ishmael is associated with Abraham in the building of the Sacred House and in the preparation of it for the rites of the pilgrimage to this place, which in III.96/90 is declared to be the first such Sacred House founded for this purpose.

¹⁵ On this matter of the change of the *qibla* see Bell, *Origin of Islam*, p. 144. It was Snouck Hurgronje in his *Het Mekaansche Feest*, pp. 28ff., who drew particular attention to this sudden change in the Qur'ānic picture of Abraham, who in the early Sūras is mentioned, as also Ishmael, merely as one of the vague religious figures of the past, but after the breach with the Jews suddenly becomes associated with Arabia and the Arabs, builds the Ka'ba and is the first of the Muslims.

This brings us face to face with a very important element in the development of Muḥammad's conception of his Qur'ān as Scripture. These additions to the Abraham story are given out as "revealed" in the same way as other Scripture material was revealed. The earlier material concerning the Abraham story was "Scripture" inasmuch as it was reproducing in Arabic what was told among the *Ahl al-Kitāb* about Abraham, even though parts of it came from legendary lore rather than from the Biblical account. Now, however, "Scripture" has expanded to include Muḥammad's own additions to the story made in the interests of developing the cultus for his community.

A second consequence was that it brought about a further definition of Muḥammad's own position with regard to Scripture. Scripture, as he understood the matter, was always associated with the labors of Allah's messengers the Prophets, to whom revelation was mediated by an angelic minister. From early in his ministry, as we have seen, he had spoken of himself as both *rasūl* and *nabī*, claiming to have been called to his mission by that angelic minister (LIII.2-18). All the various functions ascribed to the prophets in the Scriptures of the People of the Book are in his pronouncements similarly ascribed to himself. But if he is the fulfilment of the promise to the People of the Book, and the Apostle whom Abraham had prayed might be raised up, then he is the final link in the prophetic succession, and *ipso facto* his Scripture the final revelation for mankind. In IV.163/161 we find him spoken of as on the same level as the other members of the prophetic succession; in II.108/102 as in particular on a level with Moses, and in IX.113/114ff. as on a level with Abraham, but in XXXIII.40 he is the "seal of the prophets."

This latter may have been an expression already familiar to his contemporaries. The word itself—*khātām*—which is used in the Qur'ān only in this passage, is a word derived from Aramaic,¹⁶ where we find "seal" used in the sense of *obsignatio*, *finis*, *conclusio*. The claim to be the final member of the prophetic chain, the bearer of the final revelation, had been made by others before him. It is implicit in the Christian claim that God who in earlier days had spoken through the prophets had spoken a final word in the message of Jesus.¹⁷ Explicitly, however, Mani¹⁸ had claimed that he was the last

¹⁶ See my *Foreign Vocabulary of the Qur'ān*, pp. 120, 121.

¹⁷ Heb. I.1. The same notion lies behind the narrative of the Transfiguration in Matt. XVII, and in Paul's statement in Rom. X.4 that Christ is the "end of the Law." In a somewhat different sense the Talmud states (*Baba mezi'a* 85b, 86a) that R. Yehuda ha-Nasi and R. Nathan are the end of the Mishna (*sōf mishnā*) and Rab Ashi and Rabina b. Huna are the end of the teaching (*sōf hōrā'ā*), meaning that after their teaching there was nothing to be added. On the idea of Χριστὸς τέλος νόμου see now Schoeps *Aus frühchristlicher Zeit*, pp. 221-229.

¹⁸ In actual Manichaean texts this appears clearly in both the Coptic documents, e.g., *Manichäische Homilien*, ed. Polotsky, p. 11 line 25, and in the Chinese

in the succession of messengers from God, so that in the Arabic sources it is recorded that his followers called him "the Seal of the Prophets." As such Mani had issued his own Scriptures¹⁹ and had set forth a "new law" for his community. This is what Muḥammad does. He will enjoin what is right and forbid what is wrong (VII.157/156), will instruct his community in Scripture and in wisdom (II.151/146; III.164/158; LXII.2), will care for his community (IX.128/129; V.55/60), establishing dietary laws for them to follow (II.172/167ff.; V.3/4ff.; VII.157/156),²⁰ and being the arbiter will decide differences that arise among them²¹ (IV.59/62,65/58). But more than that, it is now he who will decide also among those who still hold to former Scriptures (XLII.15/14), seeing that he has the commission to be Allah's further warner and bringer of good tidings to them also (V.19/22). Thus he can claim, as Mani had claimed, that his religion is to be victorious over all other religions (IX.33).

This naturally gives the Prophet a position of peculiar authority. What more natural, then, than that this position of authority be given confirmation by revelation. Late Madinan passages in the Qur'ān have many such "revelations" with reference to the position of the Prophet in the community and the indulgences he may claim for himself in this privileged status. The community is informed that his dignity must be guarded (XXXIII.53ff.; XLVIII.9; XLIX.1-7), that he must not be treated as on the same level with ordinary believers (XXIV.62ff.; XXXIII.36,56; IX.58ff.; LVIII.5/6). He is allowed special matrimonial privileges (XXXIII.50/49ff.), and his disposition

text published in the *Journal asiatique* for 1913, p. 125, and is implicit in the statement of the Armenian writer Eznik of Kolb that Mani preached his religion as the final religion and superior to all others. Abū'l-Ma'ālī in Kessler's *Mani*, p. 372 says; "they call Mani the Seal of the Prophets," and Ibn al-Murtadā (*ibid*, p. 355), says that in Yazdanbakht's book Mani was set forth as the Seal of the Prophets, (see also al-Bīrūnī, *Chronologie*, p. 190). The wording of these Arabic writers, however, may have been drawn from the Qur'ānic phrase which was familiar to them, and which they recognized was expressing the same idea.

¹⁹ The material in the Coptic *Kephalaia* makes it quite clear that Mani was constructing a tripartite Canon of Scripture in the style of the Jewish and Christian Canons known in the area of his upbringing. See Schmidt in *Ein Mani-Fund in Aegypten*, Berlin, 1933, pp. 35, 36.

²⁰ It is somewhat curious to notice what importance seems to be given to this matter of dietary regulation. One remembers that among the injunctions to the Gentile Christians from the Apostolic gathering in Jerusalem was abstinence from certain foods (Acts XV.20). More to the point, however, are the food restrictions which Mani placed on his community, and which aroused the interest of their contemporaries both in the East and in the West. The Chinese text printed in *Journal asiatique* for 1913, pp. 265ff., comments on this, as does Augustine in his anti-Manichaean writings, e.g., *de moribus Manich.* xiii § 29, 30; xiv § 31-35; x § 36, 37; *de Haer.* xli. Similarly among the ordinances of the Montanists were some which enjoined abstinence from certain kinds of food.

²¹ cf. also IV. 105/106; XXIV.48/47 ff.

of the spoils is not to be questioned (LIX.6,7). Most curious of all, his personal affairs, in particular his domestic difficulties with his wives, become the subject of "revelations" (LXVI.1-5; XXXIII.4-6,28-34, 37-40,59; XXIV.1ff.).

The charge often brought against Muḥammad of having deliberately made use of the mechanism of revelation for his own ends can be, and not infrequently is, overstressed. The facts, however, are there in the Qur'ān itself, and were fully recognized by the older Commentators, who apparently felt no necessity to explain them away. Our present interest in these matters is in the fact that they show what Muḥammad himself is making of the concept of Scripture. He has obviously moved a long way from the idea of the heavenly archetype as that was thought of by his Jewish and Christian contemporaries. Yet the path of the development is clear. From that source of revelation, as he understood it, had come the stories of Moses, of Joseph, of David and Solomon, of Jesus and his mother, as these circulated among People of the Book, and those stories, as he was able to learn them, had in part to do with the domestic affairs of the prophets—of Joseph and Potiphar's wife, of the infancy of Moses and Pharaoh's daughter, of Moses' meeting with the daughters of Jethro, of Solomon and the Queen of Sheba, of the barrenness of Zechariah's wife and the promise of John. It may thus have been a perfectly natural transition of thought for him to conclude that, since he belonged to the prophetic succession, "revelation" could concern itself with his domestic affairs as it had with theirs, without his having any realization of the enormous gulf between the way the People of the Book understood revelation in connection with these prophetic stories and the way he was using it with reference to his own circumstances. There is no need to assume insincerity in this case, any more than there is in the case of the founder of the Mormons in producing his Book. What happened in both these cases was the application to contemporary and personal circumstances of a notion of Scripture properly relevant to very different circumstances.

The important point is that Muḥammad had come to think of revelation as at once the eternal and immutable word of God, and as applicable to the changing circumstances of his own situation. Both elements belonged to the concept of revelation as understood by the People of the Book. When Isaiah was commanded to write on a great scroll with a pen words concerning Maher-shelel-hash-baz (Isa.VIII), or to prophesy disaster in the year that Tartan came to Ashdod (Isa. XX); when Jeremiah had a message to give at the time king Zedekiah sent to him Pashur and Zephaniah to enquire about the war against Nebuchadrezzar (Jer.XXI), or when the word of the Lord came to Zechariah on the fourth day of the ninth month of the fourth year

of Darius the king (Zech.VII), those were all revelations concerned with immediate circumstances. But neither Isaiah, Jeremiah, Zechariah or any other Old Testament prophet thought of his pronouncements as destined to form part of a Book of Scripture for a community. It was the community, long after these prophets had passed away, which gathered up those among their pronouncements in which, though originally addressed to local and particular situations, they nevertheless heard a message of God which had eternal validity. It was this recognition by the community of the element of eternal validity which made them Scripture.

It was for this reason that later thought among the People of the Book tended more and more to regard the message of the divine messenger as a whole, rather than as piecemeal revelations. In Rabbinic thought it was the whole Torah, not just the Ten Commandments, that was given at Sinai.²² The compiler of IV Ezra pictures Ezra and his scribes at one session producing the twenty-four canonical and the seventy reserved books (IV Ezra.XIV,37-48), just as the writer of Slavonic Enoch represents the Patriarch dictating his visions to his sons. Thus we can understand why Muḥammad's contemporaries raised the objection that if his preachments are indeed Scripture that ought to have been sent down all at once (XXV.32/34). He however knew from experience that "inspiration" seizes a man unexpectedly, and he was aware that proclamations from a religious leader are needed as circumstances arise, so he insists that his revelation is parcelled out piecemeal (XXV.32/34; XVII.106/107). The problem facing him was that of adjusting a conception of inspiration derived from one source to a concept of Scripture derived from another, without any clear perception of the nature of the problem. The parallel here with the case of Joseph Smith and the *Book of Mormon* is striking.

One inevitable consequence of such a situation, where the prophet himself is setting forth his pronouncements as Scripture for his community, is that the community finds itself bound to regard as of eternal validity pronouncements made in particular situations of limited and temporary relevance, and often made with very little understanding of what they involve when no longer connected with those local and temporary situations. A typical example in the case of the Qur'ān is that of the *nasi'* in Sūra IX,37, where the exigencies of the war with the Meccans called forth an abrogation of the custom of intercalation that had been introduced into Arabia in pre-Islamic days in order to bring the lunar months into accord with the seasons of the solar year, and by this abrogation has bound the Muslim community for all time

²² *Ex. Rabba*, xxviii, 6 goes even further and suggests that all the messages of the later prophets were also given there.

to a lagging lunar calendar.²³ The regulations concerning polygamy, the veiling of women and slave concubinage were framed similarly in terms of a local situation. But local situations are subject to change, and at times in the Prophet's own lifetime the problems involved in changing situations arose. On his theory of Scripture how were they to be solved? By reference to the archetypal Book, for since this was with Allah He could confirm or abrogate what He wishes (XIII.39).

This notion of abrogation was not itself new. Paul in his Epistles had taught a doctrine of *abrogatio legis* in the sense that the ordinances which had been promulgated by one messenger from God were no longer valid as a whole when a new messenger had come with a fresh revelation of "the way of God" for a new generation of men. Thus Paul declares that the numerous regulations of the Law of Moses were a paedagogus to prepare men for the new law of Jesus, but many of them were abrogated by that new law proclaimed by Jesus (Rom.II-X; Gal.III-V).²⁴ So Montanus in Asia Minor, and Mani in Mesopotamia, though they admitted the inspiration of the Old and New Testaments, taught that they were superseded by certain of their own teachings, and so proceeded to lay down laws and ordinances for the new communities they believed they were called to found.²⁵ If, therefore, Muḥammad were a newly sent messenger from Allah, his formulation of regulations for the religious and social life of his community would be a natural consequence of his mission, and these regulations would abrogate, for those who followed him, the regulations they had previously been following. Jesus had said: "Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time . . . but I say unto you" (Matt.V.21ff.), a more perfect formulation of the law being given to supersede a less perfect form. So for Muḥammad to have made proclamation of new community legislation was quite in keeping with his claim to prophetic office. Those who did not believe in him might raise questions each time something new was proclaimed (IX.124/125, 127/128), just as the Jews had raised questions at the new teaching of Jesus. The Meccans might even scoff at his proclamations (IX.65/66; V.57/62), telling him that he is uttering vanity (XXX.58). They might deny that he was sent from Allah (XIII.43), and say: "O Allah, if this be from Thee, rain down upon us stones

²³ See Ibn Hishām, *Sīra*, p. 30; al-Bīrūnī, *Chronologie*, pp. 12 and 62, and the Commentaries on IX.37. There are critical discussions of the matter by C. A. Nallino 'Ilm al-Falak 'ind al-Arab, Rome, 1911, pp. 85-90; Axel Moberg, *An-Nasī' in der islamischen Tradition*, Lund, 1931; J. Fück in *OLZ*, 1933, col. 280 ff., and M. Plessner in *Der Islam* XXI, (1933), pp. 226-228.

²⁴ How this is both a confirmation of God's law and an abrogation of the Mosaic law is discussed in the *Apostolic Constitutions*, Bk. VI, § 22 and 23.

²⁵ For Montanus see Lawlor in *ERE*, VIII, 828; for Mani see Alexander of Lycopolis, cap.v and *Acta Archelai* cap.xii.

from heaven" (VIII.32). But in this he was but meeting with what bringers of revelation before him had met (III.184/181), so his teaching of an *abrogatio legis* was in principle no different from that of those other messengers in whose succession he claimed to stand, for Allah who did the sending of the message could abrogate or confirm as He chose (XIII.39).

In the Qur'ān, however, we find a quite different application of the principle of abrogation. The two relevant passages are—

XVI.101/103: "And when We substitute a verse in place of a verse—and Allah knows best what He sends down—they say: 'Thou art only a fabricator.' Nay, but most of them have no knowledge."

II.106/100: "Whatever verse We cancel or cause (thee) to forget, We bring one better than it or its like. Dost thou not know that Allah is powerful over everything?"

The point in both passages is that an earlier proclamation is being superseded by a later one. The first passage would seem to refer to some deliberate alteration of an ordinance by Muḥammad, while the other at least suggests that in issuing some injunction he had forgotten an earlier statement of his own with which this new injunction was in conflict, so that when he was reminded of this it was necessary to explain the conflict.²⁶ In any case these verses form the basis for one section of the Masorah of the Qur'ān, viz., that known as *nāsikh wa mansūkh*, which collects the various verses of the Qur'ān whose statements stand in real or apparent contradiction with one another, and arranges them to show which are the abrogating and which the abrogated verses.²⁷

Finally, in the culture of his environment, Muḥammad seems to have found a further ground on which to establish the superiority of his Scripture to all other Scriptures. If he is the seal of the prophets his religion must obviously be victorious over the other religions (IX.33, cf. LVIII.22),²⁸ and consequently his Scripture superior to theirs.

²⁶ al-Wāhidī, *Asbāb an-Nuzūl*, Cairo, 1315 A.H., pp. 211, 212 says that the tradition with regard to the first passage was that unbelievers objected that Muḥammad at one time bade his followers do such and such, but later forbade it, or eased the regulations for them, and on p. 23 says with regard to the second passage that unbelievers used to point out how Muḥammad would say one thing on one day and then go back on it another day, which to them proved that he was only producing things out of his own head not giving revelation material that he had received from Allah.

²⁷ There were works being written on this subject before the middle of the second Islamic century, if we can trust the lists in *Fihrist* p. 37. The subject occupied the attention of no less distinguished authorities than Ibn al-Kalbī (c.180) and Abū 'Uбайд al-Qāsim b. Sallām (d.224). One of the best known treatises is that by Ibn Salāma printed on the margin of al-Wāhidī's *Asbāb an-Nuzūl*, and often quoted in Nöldeke-Schwally under the name of Hibatallah.

²⁸ So in the Turfan fragment S 9 d 15 ff. Mani's religion is to rule over all others and in the fragment T II D 126 (Andreas-Henning, II.415) Mani enumerates the points in which his religion is superior to previous religions.

An exalted conception of the regard in which Scripture should be had seems to have been with him at an early period. We find Scripture referred to as honorable (*karīm*, LVI.77/76), glorious (*majīd*, L.1), sublime (*‘azīz*, XLI.41), blessed (*mubārak*, VI.92, 155/156), which none should touch but the purified (LVI.79/78). It is taught by the Merciful Himself (LV.1ff.), so that at its recital men ought to do obeisance (*sujūd*, LXXXIV.21). It is to be recited in appropriate intonation (*tartīl*, LXXIII.4), to which men should listen in silence (VII.204/203).

Much of this may have come to him along with his general concept of Scripture from the People of the Book, and that some of it did so come from them is clear from LIX.21:

“Had We sent down this Qur’ān upon a mountain, thou wouldst have seen it humbling itself, cleaving asunder out of fear of Allah,”

which is but a reproduction of the Rabbinic legends about Sinai being humble for the reception of the Torah, not proud and disdainful like Tabor and Hermon and Carmel,²⁹ and about how it was wrenched from its anchorage in earth when the Torah came to be delivered upon it.³⁰ The People of the Book, however, were by no means prepared to accept Muḥammad’s “revelations” as on a level with those in the Books in their possession, even though he claims that Allah has put things in his message in order to convince the *Ahl al-Kitāb* and remove their doubts (LXXIV.31ff.). Allah desires, he tells them, that those who have “the knowledge” may know that this is the truth from their Lord, that they may believe in it and their hearts acquiesce in it (XXII.54/53). Some of them apparently did. Passages which speak of the learned among the Children of Israel recognizing his message (XXVI.197; XXVIII.52, 53; XXIX.47/46; XLVI.10/9; VI.114; XIII.36) may mean no more than that they recognized the stories about various Biblical characters which he told in his preaching, but when we read in XVII.107/108ff. (cf. XIII.36) that those to whom “the knowledge” has been given fall down in obeisance when they hear it recited, fall on their faces weeping, and in V.83/86ff. that the Christians with tears hail the message, and beg Allah to write them down as those that bear witness to it, this, if it can be taken at face value, indicates a much deeper impression made by his message.³¹ This need not be a surprise. At a much later date the curious Messianic mission of Sabbatai Zevi in 1666 caused such a tide of emotion as “never was

²⁹ cf. the Targum to Judges V.5 in de Lagarde *Prophetæ chaldaice* (1872), p. 39; Praetorius *Targum zum Buch der Richter* (1900), p. 11.

³⁰ Friedmann’s *Nishpahim to Seder Eliyahu zuta* (Wien, 1904), p. 55.

³¹ cf. XXXIX.23/24: “Allah has sent down the best of discourses, a Book in harmony with itself, a *mathānī* at which the skins of those who fear the Lord do creep. But then their skins and hearts soften at the remembrance of Allah. That is Allah’s guidance whereby He guides whom He chooses.”

seen before, nor will be again till the true redemption comes,"³² and the present writer can remember from his boyhood stories of the extravagant emotions stirred in certain groups when John Dowie announced himself in Australia as the Elijah whose coming was promised. A less stirring work than *Millennial Dawn* would be hard to imagine, yet in our own generation Russellite propagandists tell of folk so overcome at hearing it read that they fall on their faces weeping.

As a whole, however, the People of the Book were unresponsive (X.15/16; IV.61/64; II.89/83ff., 176/171; XLI.13/12, 26/25; IX.124/125), indeed were rather contemptuous of its claims to be Scriptural (X.15/16; VII.203/202; XLI.26/25; XIII.43; IX.129/130), or to be anything more than his own invention (XXV.4/5; XXI.5; X.38/39; XI.13/16, 35/37; XXXII.3/2; XLVI.8/7); calling it a medley of dreams (XXI.5), a vain babbling (XXV.30/32), the uttering of vanity (XXX.58). Since it but increases them in unbelief (V.64/69, 68/72), he concludes that Allah has placed a veil between him and them when he recites it (XVII.45/47; XVIII.57/55; cf. XLI.5/4; VI.25),³³ and is encouraged by the assurance that the time will come when men will recognize its message (XXXVIII.88). Indeed, though men reject it the Jinn turn aside to hearken to it (XLVI.29/28), recognizing that it is a marvellous discourse (LXXII.1; cf. XLVI.30/29).

On this latter point, that of its marvellousness, Islam has built a claim to the Qur'ān's uniqueness among books of Scripture. The Merciful Himself taught it (LV.1ff.), but so did He teach Scripture to Moses (VII.145/142),³⁴ and to Jesus (III.48/43). It is true pages, in which are true Scriptures (XCVIII.2ff.), but that was the claim they also made. It was "sent down," but so were the other Scriptures. It recited the "signs" of Allah, but so did they. In it Allah set forth every kind of similitude (XVII.89/91), but the *mathal* was characteristic also of the Scriptures of the Jews and the Christians. If he can claim that it is something that could not have been devised save by Allah (X.37/38),³⁵ the same was true of them, for Amos long be-

³² de Botton quoted in Scholem, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism*, p. 284.

³³ Paul's words in II Cor. iii, 14-16 come immediately to mind, but the coincidence in the use of this image is probably fortuitous.

³⁴ This was already familiar teaching. *Ex. Rabba* ii, 6 states that God Himself taught Moses the Torah. Jesus said: "I have not spoken of myself, but the Father which sent me, he gave me a commandment, what I should say, and what I should speak" (Jno. XII.49). Later Montanus claimed that the phrases he uttered in his preaching were the *ipsissima verba* of the Almighty.

³⁵ Sūra IV.82/84 argues that were it from other than Allah it would contain contradictions. In view of the many contradictions it does contain this seems to us strange, but perhaps it was meant to say that the stories etc., which Muhammad was using in his preaching, were not different from those known to and repeated by the Jews and Christians.

fore had explained how God reveals His secret to His servants the prophets (Amos III.7). If the statements that "it clears up everything" (XVI.89/91), and is "an explanation of everything" (XII.111), mean that it contains all knowledge necessary to salvation, the same claim was made for the earlier Scriptures. If angels are its witnesses (IV.166/164), so, according to the Rabbis, were they witnesses to the Torah.³⁶

Wherein then lies this marvellousness which makes it unique? The Arabs claimed that they could produce the like (VIII.31), and so they are challenged on this point.

XI.13/16: "Do they say: 'He has invented it'? Say: 'Then produce ten Sūras like it that have been invented, and call upon whom ye will apart from Allah, if ye be truth-speakers.'"

X.38/39: is the same wording save that they are challenged to produce only one Sūra.

II.23/21: "If ye are in doubt about what We have sent down to Our servant, then produce a Sūra like it, and call upon your witnesses other than Allah, if ye are truth-speakers."

Then in XVII.88/90 his critics are told that if Jinn and men were to combine their efforts they could not produce its like. When we ask precisely what it was they could not imitate we have two hints as to the answer. In LII.34, which is a much earlier challenge than those just given, they are challenged to produce a discourse (*ḥadīth*) like it. Then in XXVIII.49, where Muḥammad's message is being compared by his audience to that of Moses, he says:

"Produce then a Book from Allah which guides better than the two of them (and) I will follow it, if ye be truth-speakers."

This would seem to mean that its uniqueness lies in the fact that it brings the message giving guidance to the way of Allah, the story of Allah's dealings with men and plans for men, in an Arabic medium that they could understand (XLIII.3/2; XII.2). The revelation formerly given to Abraham and confirmed again and again in the messages brought by the succession of prophets, had been corrupted by the Jews and the Christians, and even what they had in their hands was available only in a strange tongue.³⁷ But now to the last of the prophets Allah had made the message easy in his own tongue (XLIV.58; XIX.97), confirming in Arabic earlier Scripture (XLVI.12/11), that they might be able to take warning (XLII.7/5; VI.92). So it is a Book whose verses are made plain (*faṣṣala* XLI.3/2; XI.1; VI.114),

³⁶ See the *Orehot Zaddikim* quoted in Ginzberg, *Legends of the Jews*, V.417.

³⁷ It is certain that no Arabic version of either the Old or the New Testament was current in Muḥammad's day, though it is not impossible that in North Arabia some attempts at rendering portions of it into Arabic had been made. Perhaps Sūra XLI.44 reflects the fact that his audiences were accustomed to Scripture in a non-Arabic form.

whose signs are clear (XXII.16), and which will make plain those matters about which the people ask (V.101). This is why it was a marvellous discourse, and inimitable.

"Is it then not enough for them that We have sent down to thee the Book to be recited to them? Verily in that there is a mercy and a reminder for a community which believes" (XXIX.51/50).

There is no statement in the Qur'ān that this has anything miraculous about it, beyond the fact that all revelation is in itself miraculous. Yet it is called a "clear sign" (*āya* XXIX.49/48) and *āya* is the word for "miracle," so that at an early date Islamic orthodoxy developed a theory that the uniqueness of the Qur'ān lay in the miraculousness of its matchless perfection as an Arabic composition. The outstanding cultural accomplishment of the pagan Arabs had been their poetry. The Qur'ān is not poetry (XXXVI.69). It is in the rhymed prose of rhythmic structure in which the ancient soothsayers used to set forth their gnomic wisdom, and which perhaps was a survival of a very ancient Semitic form for the proclamation of religious utterances.³⁸ As Muḥammad used it to set forth the final restatement of the original faith of Abraham, however, it reached perfection, which not Jinn and men combined could emulate. This is the famous doctrine of *i'jāz al-Qur'ān*, which to the present day has been the strongest factor working against any real critical approach among Muslim peoples to the study of the Qur'ān as Scripture.

ARTHUR JEFFERY

*Columbia University,
New York City*

³⁸ This was argued with great learning by D. H. Müller in his *Die Propheten in ihrer ursprünglichen Form; die Grundgesetze der Ursemitischen Poesie erschlosse und nachgewiesen in Bibel, Keilinschriften und Koran*, Wien, 1896.

FREE WILL AND PREDESTINATION IN EARLY ISLAM II

(Concluded from the July issue)

A student once remarked at this point, "Man seconds the motion." But long before him al-Juwainī had observed that "To assume an influence upon [the form of] a state, which cannot be grasped by reason, is just the same as to deny that influence,"⁵¹ and the Mu'tazilites had declared that "acquisition" as defined by the Ash'arites was a meaningless expression, and that to maintain that man's power exercises an influence upon an act, but does not produce it, is *jabar*, Necessitarianism.⁵² But above and beyond the fact of choice there is according to al-Bāqillānī and his followers the influence of the created power upon the direction, or quality of the human act, in regard to which the human power cooperates with God in some fashion or other without assisting in the creation of the act; and a century before him al-Najjār asserted that the existence, or non-existence, of the act depends upon the existence, or non-existence of that power, and that by that power alone man "acquires" the act⁵³—and so becomes responsible for it. The statement in the *Sharḥ al-Fiqh al-Akbar* quoted by Dr. Watt, that "The creating is the act of God and consists in the origination of the power in man, but the use of the originated power is the act of man really and not metaphorically,"⁵⁴ is much more intelligible and is related probably to the view of many Mu'tazilites as recorded by al-Ash'arī that the power "is employed in the act, meaning that the act is performed by it,"⁵⁵ except that the Māturīdites in opposition to the majority of the Mu'tazilites, believed that the power does not persist two moments.

Dr. Watt has shown⁵⁶ that the orthodox solution of the problem of human freedom in a fixed radius of determinism goes back to the heyday of the Mu'tazilite movement in the middle of the ninth century A.D., at which time most, if not all, of the ideas employed later by the Orthodox theologians had already been put forward and argued, even if the pattern of the orthodox position was not finally fixed for a century after al-Ash'arī died (935 A.D.). With Ḍirār b. 'Amr, the predecessor of Abū'l-Hudhail (died c.856 A.D.) as head of the school in Baṣra, we find the idea of man's "acqui-

⁵¹ C. I. 70.15.

⁵² Cf. A. de Vlieger, *Kitāb al-Qadar*, p. 183.

⁵³ R. 283.8.

⁵⁴ Watt, 155.

⁵⁵ R. 235.15-16.

⁵⁶ Cf. Watt, 93-134.

tion" of acts created by God and also that of the dual agency of God and man in these acts; for in Ḍirār's eyes man was an agent therein in reality and not just by analogy, as the Baghdādian Thumāma maintained;⁵⁷ and according to al-Najjār, a younger contemporary of Ḍirār, "capacity" (*istitā'a*, defined as the power (*qudra*) to do or not to do an act) does not precede the act, but is the help (*'awn*) originated by God in the moment of the act along with the act; and two acts are not performed by one capacity, but each act has a capacity, which comes-to-be along with it; and a capacity does not persist."⁵⁸ Al-Shahrastānī also informs us that al-Najjār affirmed an influence for the originated power and named it "acquisition," as did al-Ash'arī⁵⁹ [later].

In the views advanced by Ḍirār and al-Najjār the essentials of the orthodox position are already anticipated, as Dr. Watt has observed.⁶⁰ Dr. Watt identifies Ḍirār and al-Najjār and his followers with a group named by al-Ash'arī *ahl-al-ithbāt*, "The Affirmers" (of the Divine Qadar (Power)), Predestinarians, to which group Dr. Watt allots an important part in the development of the orthodox doctrines of Predestination and Free-will, "as adversaries, who at a comparatively early period . . . were able to meet the Mu'tazilites on their own ground,"⁶¹ and who would play, then, the traditional rôle assigned to al-Ash'arī, al-Māturīdī and al-Ṭahāwī, who all lived a generation or two later. Dr. Watt might have pressed his argument with advantage further. For al-Ash'arī's statements regarding the "Affirmers" point to the fact that they were, as Dr. Watt quite correctly, I think, judges them to have been, a corporate body or "theological school (or schools),"⁶² in al-Ash'arī's own days, and that they exercised a considerable influence on his theological thinking. Al-Ash'arī speaks of having seen and heard one of them, al-Kūshānī namely,⁶³ and sometimes reports them as "saying" and not as "having said";⁶⁴ and occasionally he declares his own position on some doctrine by affirming or disavowing their statement of it.

Al-Kūshānī, for example, did not believe that the Creator "makes" (causes) injustice, since this statement would imply that He is unjust, and al-Ash'arī remarks: "In my opinion this statement

⁵⁷ Cf. Watt, pp. 104-105; C. I. 63.11-12; R. 407.10-11; cf. R. 549.12. Al-Shakhhām also held that one movement could have two agents (*qādirānī*) God and man.

⁵⁸ See Watt, 106-107 and R. 283.5 ff.

⁵⁹ C. I. 62.5.

⁶⁰ Watt, 115-116.

⁶¹ Watt, 113.

⁶² Cf. Watt, 112.

⁶³ Cf. R. 540.4; 541.3.

⁶⁴ Cf. R. 537.14; 541.1, 3, 6.

is erroneous.”⁶⁵ In answer to the question whether, or not, God has power over the genus of that over which He has given His creatures power, most of the “Affirmers” replied by denying that the Creator has the power to compel men to be believers or unbelievers, just or unjust, although they all maintained that He has the power to create the belief, unbelief, acquisition, obedience and disobedience, by virtue of which they are believers, or unbelievers, acquirers, obedient, or disobedient,⁶⁶ and al-Ash’arī comments: “I myself declare that God has the power to compel His creatures to [do] everything, the power to create which as an acquisition on their part is attributed to Him; it is even possible that He compel them to [do] injustice.”⁶⁷

Here again al-Ash’arī seems to contradict the “Affirmers,” but actually his position is practically indistinguishable from theirs, as his statement of their stand on the question of whether, or not, God has power over man’s doing wrong and injustice, his belief and acquisition, proves. For according to him they believed that the power to do wrong or injustice, or to acquire, is not attributed to God, *nor power over a wrong which men do not acquire*,⁶⁸ but that God has the power to compel man to do wrong and injustice, and that He is the agent (*fā’il*) of all wrong and injustice in the world.⁶⁹ Al-Ash’arī also accepted the “Affirmers’” judgment that *makhhlūq* (created thing) and *muḥdath* (initiated thing) are synonymous terms.⁷⁰

Al-Ash’arī states the position of the “Affirmers” on quite a number of questions, such as, for example, Divine Guidance and Leading Astray, Divine Help and Abandonment, Divine Favor and Protection, the Punishment of Hell, Perception and the Attributes.⁷¹ But his presentation of their views on the nature and locus of human power and on the meanings of the terms, “Creation” (*khalq*), “Action” (*fi’l*), and “Acquisition” (*kasb*), deserves perhaps special attention here. “The meaning of the Creator’s being a creator,” they said, “is that the act happens on his part by an eternal power (*qudra*), and only the Creator acts by an eternal power; and the meaning of acquisition is that the act happens by an “initiated” (*muḥdath*) power. Everyone whose act happens on his part by an eternal power is an agent (*fā’il*) and creator, but that one whose

⁶⁵ R. 541.3-5.

⁶⁶ R. 550.7; 552.1-3 and 551.15-17.

⁶⁷ R. 552.8-9.

⁶⁸ Al-Ash’arī excepts some parties of the “Affirmers” in regard to this particular statement.

⁶⁹ R. 554.12-16.

⁷⁰ R. 541.11-12.

⁷¹ Cf. R. 260.6; 262.5,15; 263.6; 264.12; 265.6; 383.1; 485.15; 537.14.

act happens by an "initiated" power is an acquirer (*muktasib*)."⁷² Some of them *maintain* (in present tense), says al-Ash'arī later, that God acts in reality in the sense that He creates, and that man does not act in reality, but acquires in reality, since only that one, who creates, acts in reality; for linguistically agent means creator, and if man could create some of his acquisition, he could create all of it, just as the Eternal has created all of His action, since He has created some of it."⁷³ A page earlier al-Ash'arī has reported that "many of the 'Affirmers' say that man is an agent in reality in the sense of an acquirer, and they mean [by that]," adds al-Ash'arī, "that he is a '*muḥdith*' (initiator)." "I have heard," he goes on, "that one of them asserted unconditionally that man is a *muḥdith* in reality in the sense of an acquirer."⁷⁴

A *muḥdith* is probably one whose act happens on his part by an initiated (*muḥdath*) power;⁷⁵ and in this phase of the thought of the "Affirmers" the orthodox conception of the nature of human power is already clearly adumbrated and also the orthodox understanding of the terms, creation and action. They all denied also, al-Ash'arī informs us, except Ẹirār b. 'Amr, that man acts in another [locus] than himself,⁷⁶ that the flight of a stone, for example, is the result of man's throwing, and declared generally in answer to the question whether God has power, or not, over that over which He has given His creatures power, that "there is nothing potential (*maqdūr*), over which God has not power, just as there is nothing knowable (*ma'lūm*), which God does not know."⁷⁷

Another element of their thought reported by al-Ash'arī seems also to foreshadow orthodox doctrine. They maintained⁷⁸ that "if God were to guide the unbelievers aright, they would be rightly guided, but [that] since He does not guide them aright, they are not rightly guided, [that] nevertheless He guides them aright, inasmuch as He gives them the power (*qudra*) to be rightly guided,⁷⁹ which power to be rightly guided is named guidance, and [that] He also guides them aright, inasmuch as He creates their guidance."

⁷² R. 538.16-539.3.

⁷³ R. 541.6. The "Affirmers" are evidently the group who are recorded by al-Ash'arī (R. 228.7) as maintaining that the terms "Doer" (*fā'il*) and "Creator" (*khāliq*) are synonymous, but that they do not apply them unconditionally to man, since that is forbidden.

⁷⁴ R. 540.1.

⁷⁵ Cf. al-Ash'arī's own definition of "acquisition," R. 542.8.

⁷⁶ R. 408.4.

⁷⁷ 549.7 and 550.4, which is the position of Al-Jubbā'ī and many Mu'tazilites in regard to "movements" and "rests." See R. 551.3.

⁷⁸ R. 260.6.

⁷⁹ Cf. R. 263.6 on *taufiq*.

The missing factor, which would turn unbelievers into believers, is obviously divine favor (*lutf*), which according to the "Affirmers" has no end, nor limit, but which God shows only to believers, whose power to be obedient is a favour, and whose obedience itself is a favour.⁸⁰ Thus a man may have the power, or capacity, to be a believer and obedient, and God may create his belief and obedience, but if God does not also grant him favour,⁸¹ he remains an unbeliever and disobedient.

It is clear, then, that, from the very beginning of the so-called Mu'tazilite movement, there were theologians, no less expert than al-Ash'arī in the dialectic, who did not accept the general Mu'tazilite position on the question of man's freedom and power to act, and who in the course of the debate on that question formulated theories regarding human power and its relation to the divine power, which later were to be adopted without great change by such influential scholars as al-Ash'arī and al-Māturidī and so enter into the pattern of the orthodox doctrines of Predestination and Free-will. But it may be argued further, I think, that into that pattern were also woven theories propounded by the advocates of man's natural liberty to act on choice and based on philosophical systems altogether alien to the fundamental presuppositions of orthodox thought. For if the various theses advanced in Mu'tazilite circles on such questions as the nature of the body, the atom, mediated, or, as they are called in Arabic, "generated" acts, and the specific being of man, are taken into account, it becomes increasingly evident that some of these theses exercised an immediate influence on the orthodox conception of the problem of free-will.

Most of the Mu'tazilites supposed that bodies are composed of atoms;⁸² and the accidents, which, when combined and united in a permanent consolidation, make up a body for ʿIṣṣār b. 'Amr, were probably also atoms.⁸³ Man according to ʿIṣṣār consists of many things, such as colour, taste, smell and power (*quwwa*) etc., which, when combined, are man, and which constitute the only substances

⁸⁰ Cf. R. 577.7 ff.

⁸¹ Cf. R. 265.6 on Abandonment.

⁸² R. 301.3-304.15. Listed are Abū'l-Ḥusain al-Šāliḥī, 'Isā al-Šūfī Al-Iskāfī, Abū Bishr Šāliḥ, Abū 'l-Hudhail, Al-Jubbā'i, Mu'ammār, Hishām b. 'Amr al-Fuwaṭī. For al-Nazzām the body is the long, broad and deep, which is infinitely divisible (R. 304.13).

⁸³ R. 305. 5 ff., cf. 317.13 ff.; cf. R. 345.14, where ʿIṣṣār says Capacity and life are parts of the body, and 306.13, which reports that Sulaimān b. Jarīr thought that Capacity is one of the parts of the body just like color and taste, and that it is contiguous to the body; cf. C. 63.12-13. Al-Shahrastānī reports ʿIṣṣār as maintaining that Capacity (*istitā'a*) and impotence (*'ajz*) are parts of the body and the part is a body.

(*jawāhir*) in the world.⁸⁴ For Abū 'l-Hudhail, Hishām al-Fuwatī and most of the Mu'tazilites, man is this body composed of atoms and bearing the accidents of knowledge, power, life, movement, rest, taste, etc., which accidents according to Abū'l-Hudhail and the majority of the Mu'tazilites persist,⁸⁵ but which with al-Ka'bī and some others do not persist two moments.⁸⁶

On the other hand, one of the earliest of the Mu'tazilites, Mu'ammār, maintained that man is in reality "a form or incorporeal substance, which knows, has power and chooses freely, but which is neither a moving, nor a resting thing, nor a thing that comes to be, or occupies space, or is seen, touched, or perceived . . . but which governs the body."⁸⁷ Al-Ash'arī cites Mu'ammār as saying that "man is an indivisible atom, in which can inhere knowledge, power, life, desire and antipathy, but not combination, nor separation, movement, rest, colour, taste, nor smell."⁸⁸ As al-Shahrastānī remarks, "This is the philosophers' idea of the soul as a substance, subsisting in itself, without extension or place," although al-Ash'arī's statement of Mu'ammār's idea lends to the soul a materialistic trait.⁸⁹

Mu'ammār, however, also believed that no act, be it immediate, or mediated, belongs to man, but only willing (*irāda*), and so distinguished between the acts of the soul and of the body. "The act of the soul," he said, "is willing, and nothing else, and the soul is man, so that man's [only] act is willing; and movements, rests and tensions, which go beyond that, belong to the acts of the body."⁹⁰ Mu'ammār denied, therefore, that the [canonical] acts of standing, sitting, moving and resting prescribed for men go back to their will either immediately or mediately.

Meanwhile the founder of the Baghdad School of Mu'tazilites, Bishr b. al-Mu'tamir, had originated the doctrine of *tawallud*, "generation" or mediation, or, as we might call it, causation. "He supposed," says al-Shahrastānī, "that colour, taste and smell, and all the perceptions of hearing and seeing, could happen by "generation" or mediation from the action of one thing upon another, if, that is, their causes were from that action,"⁹¹ an idea which he adopted according to al-Shahrastānī from the "Naturalists" (*ṭabī-*

⁸⁴ R. 330.3; cf. Burghūth, R. 330.11.

⁸⁵ Cf. R. 229.9,13; 329.9,12; 330.8; 345.6-10.

⁸⁶ Cf. R. 344.9-12; 345.6-11; 346.3-5,13; 347.9-12, 13.

⁸⁷ C. I. 47.5-10.

⁸⁸ R. 318.3.

⁸⁹ C. I. 47.8-10. A conception of the soul repudiated by orthodox theologians, who describe it as an accident, as did also, however, the Mu'tazilite Ja'far b. Ḥarb (R. 337.9).

⁹⁰ C. I. 47.1-2 and 12 ff.; cf. R. 405.3 ff.

⁹¹ C. I. 47.2-4; cf. R. 404.4-9.

'*iyūn*), or materialists, who, however, al-Shahrastānī adds, did not, like Bishr, distinguish between a mediated act and an immediate act by power (*qudra*) and often, indeed, did not recognize power at all, as the Mutakallimūn conceived of it, the potentiality (*quwwa*) of acting upon and being acted upon being quite different from the power which the Mutakallimūn assert, which is the capacity to do, or not to do, a thing.⁹²

Bishr thought that mediated acts are the result of man's action, as did also his vis-à-vis in Baṣra, Abū 'l-Hudhail, who declared that "what is mediated by the act of a creature is his act."⁹³ But Bishr's disciple, Thumāma, influenced apparently by the speculations of Mu'ammar, maintained that "man's only act is willing, and what goes beyond that happens without an agent (or initiator) (*muḥdith*), for example, the flight of a stone upon the throwing of it, etc., which is attributed to man only by analogy";⁹⁴ and the famous essayist, al-Jāḥiẓ, is reported as saying that "what comes after willing is man's by his nature and not by his free choice; the only act of free choice which happens on his part is willing," a statement repeated by al-Shahrastānī in the following form: "The only acquisition of the creatures is willing; their acts happen naturally," just as Thumāma said, adds al-Shahrastānī.⁹⁵

Dirār b. 'Amr, the predecessor of Abū 'l-Hudhail as head of the School of Baṣra, and, as we have seen, an "Affirmer" and the probable originator of the doctrine of Acquisition,⁹⁶ held that "man acts in another locus than himself," and that the movement, or rest, "generated" in another by his act is an acquisition on his part created by God. He said that "what is 'generated' by their (men's) action, but can be abstained from, when they so will, is their act; but if they cannot refrain from it, when they so will, it is not their act."⁹⁷ But his disciple, al-Najjār, and, as has already been related, the rest of the "Affirmers" denied that man acts in another locus than himself and attributed these acts, therefore, to God, whose immediate creation of them, since accidents according to al-Najjār and his followers do not persist two moments, replaced with them the nature of al-Jāḥiẓ and Thumāma.⁹⁸

⁹² C. I. 44.15-20; cf. Watt, 74.

⁹³ Cf. R. 401.5 and C. 35.18.

⁹⁴ R. 407.9 ff.

⁹⁵ R. 407.12 ff.; C. 52.7 ff.

⁹⁶ Cf. Watt, 62, 104.

⁹⁷ R. 408.4 and 407.14.

⁹⁸ C. I. 60.1-2; R. 284.9; 283.5. To complete the record it may be added that Al-Nazzām, the philosopher of the Mu'tazilites, thought that every act which goes beyond the locus of a power belongs to the action of God by virtue of His having brought the creation into existence and stamped upon things a nature, which they obey. When the force of the throw is exhausted, for example, the stone returns to its place naturally.

One named Ṣāliḥ and nicknamed Qubba (Dome) pressed this philosophical thesis to a logical, if ludicrous conclusion, which is nevertheless not only entertaining, but instructive, revealing, at least, the irrational basis of the logical superstructure. Ṣāliḥ maintained that "man acts only within himself, and that what takes place upon his act, such as the flight of a stone upon his throwing it, or the burning of wood upon its contact with fire, etc., is created by God, and that God could lodge a stone in a rare atmosphere for a thousand years without creating in it [the accident of] falling, but creating in it instead [the accident of] rest, or bring fire and wood together without creating [the accident of] burning or place a mountain upon a man without the man finding it heavy, etc., or give perception in spite of blindness, and knowledge notwithstanding death, etc."⁹⁹ And similar statements are found with better known scholars than Ṣāliḥ, among them ʿĪrār b. ʿAmr himself and Abū ʿI-Ḥusain al-Ṣāliḥi.¹⁰⁰

Orthodox Islam accepted the thesis that all created things are constituted of quality-less, indivisible atoms of matter and of accidents which do not persist for two moments, existence being an accident, that man is such a thing composed of a body and of the accidents of knowledge, life and power, movement and rest, color, taste, and smell, hearing and seeing, etc., which inhere in it, that his essential and only real act is willing, although even that is subject to the will and favor of God, and that the other acts attributed to him are in reality God's acts, since to act is to create, and only the Eternal Power can create, but that he "acquires" these acts as his own, when he wills them, and his power, the created power, enters into them, inasmuch as he is then conscious of their quality, and chooses them and devotes his power to their attainment, if God create them, and turns them into acts of intention, for which he is responsible. But Muslim theologians of the ninth and tenth Christian centuries had already said all that, if not exactly in this concatenation of ideas.

Dr. Watt has pointed out that the tenth century Mu'tazilite, al-Ka'bī (d. 317/18. H.), "is reported to have had an atomistic conception of human power," maintaining, with some others, that it does not persist two moments, a doctrine introduced, Dr. Watt thinks, by the "Affirmer" of the preceding century, al-Najjār,¹⁰¹ and he has also called attention to the fact that al-Najjār's contem-

⁹⁹ R. 406.6-407.1.

¹⁰⁰ Cf. R. 306.8 ff. and 309.12-311.4.

¹⁰¹ Cf. Watt, pp. 80 and 109, R. 230.9; 232.14 and note 58.

porary, al-Nazzām, the philosopher of the Mu'tazilites, is related to have taught that bodies are created every moment.¹⁰² The atomic conception of matter prevailed in some form or other, as we have already observed, in early Mu'tazilite circles, its proponents including Abū 'l-Hudhail, Mu'ammār, Al-Jubbā'ī, Hishām al-Fuwatī, al-Iskāfī, 'Isā al-Ṣūfī, Abū 'l-Ḥusain al-Ṣāliḥī, and even Abū 'l-Hudhail's predecessor in Baṣra, the "Affirmer," Ẹirār b. 'Amr;¹⁰³ and it is quite probable, therefore, as Dr. Watt's discussion suggests, that the atomic conception of time was introduced into and became naturalized in orthodox circles during the debate over the persistence or non-persistence of accidents, and of human power in particular.¹⁰⁴

Dr. Watt has discussed the problem of human power, or capacity (*istiṭā'a*), in his chapter on the Mu'tazilites,¹⁰⁵ who in general affirmed that capacity is before the act and defined it as a power (*qudra*) for an act or its opposite, or to do a thing or leave it alone, but not an efficient cause of the act.¹⁰⁶ Dr. Watt connects this common Mu'tazilite conception of human power and action with Abū 'l-Hudhail's theory of "moments" or "times," stated by al-Ash'arī as follows: "A 'time' (*waqt*) is the separation between acts and is a space (or term, *madā*) between [one] act and [another] act, and with every time an act happens (*yaḥdathu*) (or reading *Yuḥdathu* with Watt 'is originated')";¹⁰⁷ and he seems to take this statement as meaning that a "time" is the duration of an act, translating the second clause of the citation thus: "and it extends through the interval from act to act."¹⁰⁸

Dr. Watt then goes on to expound Abū 'l-Hudhail's notion of the relation of capacity to action. In answer to the question whether man is capable (*qādir 'alā*) in the first ["time"] of acting in it, or acts in the second, Abū 'l-Hudhail said: "Man is capable of acting in the first and acts in it, but the act happens in the second; for the first 'time' is the 'time' of [which it is said], 'He acts,' and the second 'time' is the 'time' of [which it is said], 'He has acted';"¹⁰⁹ and his disciple, al-Nazzām, declared with a slight, but significant, variation adopted by most Mu'tazilites, that "Man is capable in the first 'time' of acting in the second 'time,' and it is said before the second 'time'

¹⁰² Cf. Watt, p. 81 and R. 404, 10-11.

¹⁰³ Cf. R. 301.5-6; 301.7 ff.; 302.1 ff.; 302.5 ff.; 302.10 ff.; 302.16; 303.9; 304.1; 305.5, and notes 82 and 83.

¹⁰⁴ Cf. R. 230 ff.

¹⁰⁵ Pp. 69 ff.

¹⁰⁶ R. 230.12 and Watt 69-70; cf. R. 230.15; 231.4; 233.2-3.

¹⁰⁷ R. 443.2-3. See Watt 70.

¹⁰⁸ Watt, 70.

¹⁰⁹ R. 233.9, Watt, 70.

comes to be that 'the act will be performed in the second 'time,' then when the second 'time' has come to be, [it is said that] 'the act has been performed'."¹¹⁰

To interpret these statements, Dr. Watt assumes that Abū 'l-Hudhail and his disciples drew a distinction between the mental and physical aspects of an act, and that "the first moment or time is that in which the internal or mental aspect of the act takes place, the decision to do X rather than Y, and the issuing of commands to the body; and that the second moment or time is that of the execution of the act in the external or physical sphere";¹¹¹ and in support of this interpretation of the theory of "times" or "moments" he refers to a statement of al-Shahrastānī in his exposition of Abū 'l-Hudhail's doctrines regarding a distinction which the latter made between "acts of the heart" and "acts of the members."

"Abū 'l-Hudhail 'distinguished'," says al-Shahrastānī, "between acts of the hearts and acts of the members and declared that it is incredible that acts of the hearts can exist, when the power (*qudra*) is non-existent; capacity (*istiṭā'a*) accompanies these acts in the moment of the act. But he considered this possible in the case of acts of the members." Knowledge, for example, cannot exist, when the capacity to know is non-existent through injury or death, but an act of a member may exist, when the capacity no longer exists, the flight of a stone, for example, upon the throwing of it by one who then suddenly dies.¹¹² But this statement contradicts rather than supports Dr. Watt's thesis that "The power is the 'internal' or 'mental' power of willing, of deciding between the act and its opposite; this belongs to the first moment, and must therefore be prior to the act, which belongs to the second moment."¹¹³ For in this statement Abū 'l-Hudhail declares that the power accompanies the act in the moment of the act; and this is true even in the case of acts of the members except in very special circumstances. Dr. Watt's "internal" or "mental" power, willing, moreover, is itself, in fact, also an act, an act of the heart, whose capacity accompanies it in the moment of the action.¹¹⁴

The Mu'tazilites' discussion of the will brings out the distinction which they drew between will and power. Al-Ash'arī reports that they debated the question whether, or not, the will is an efficient cause of what has been willed, and that Abū 'l-Hudhail and most of his fellows declared that it is an efficient cause of what has been

¹¹⁰ R. 234.4, Watt, 71.

¹¹¹ Watt, pp. 70 and 71.

¹¹² C. I. 35.15 ff.; cf. R. 232.1-7, esp. 5-7, also 232.10-12.

¹¹³ Watt, 72.

¹¹⁴ Cf. R. 232.6-7.

willed, if that follows it immediately,¹¹⁵ whereas, as we have already learned, capacity, or the power to do a thing or its opposite, was not in their opinion an efficient cause of the act.¹¹⁶ They also debated whether, or not, a man is capable of the opposite of what has been willed in the moment (*ḥāl*) of his efficient willing; and some of them held that a man is capable of that, but that he does only what has been willed; and they illustrated this by an act of which it is known that it will be, while the man is still capable of doing the opposite of it, and it is known [that it will be] only because he chooses it and nothing else.¹¹⁷

Abū 'l-Hudhail's two "times" or "moments" do not signify, then, so far as I can judge, the two phases of an act suggested by Dr. Watt and may bear, indeed, their literal and proper meaning. Abū 'l-Hudhail describes the second "time" as the "time of [which it is said], he has acted"; and his disciple, al-Nazzām, says of it that "when the second 'time' has come to be, [it is said that] the act has been performed."¹¹⁸ The act, that is to say, is completed with the second "time," and so with Abū 'l-Hudhail and most of the Mu'tazilites capacity, which is necessary before an act, is not necessary for the act in the moment of its existence in order that there be done by means of it (capacity) what has [already] been done. "When the act exists," says Abū 'l-Hudhail, "a man has no need of it (capacity) at all; and impotence (*ʾaǧz*) may occur in the second 'time,' " i.e., impotence for this very act; "for in his opinion," explains al-Ash'arī "impotence is not impotence for an existing thing."¹¹⁹ The act, therefore, is a completed act with the second "time."

Of the first "time" Abū 'l-Hudhail says that man is capable of acting in it and acts in it, but that the act happens in the second, a proposition which al-Shahrastānī states as follows: "Capacity is an accident and precedes the act so that man acts by means of it in the first moment (*ḥāl*), even if the act is found (or 'brought into existence') only in the second."¹²⁰ The first "time" or "moment" would be, then, the passing of the preceding capacity into action, which action would find its consummation in the second "time" or "moment."

But a "time" (or "moment") is the separation between acts, the space (or term) between [one] act and [another] act, and with every "time" an act happens.¹²¹ A "time," therefore, is both the begin-

¹¹⁵ R. 415.5 and 7.

¹¹⁶ See note 106.

¹¹⁷ R. 416.5 and 7. cf. also the implication of the statements in R. 238.1 ff.; 238.14-15; 238.16-239.2, and 229.15.

¹¹⁸ Cf. notes 109 and 110.

¹¹⁹ Cf. R. 232.1 ff. and 232.8 ff.

¹²⁰ Cf. note 109 and C. 35.14-18.

¹²¹ See note 107.

ning and the end of action, the commencement of an act as well as the completion of an act; and the two "times" are the two terms or limits of an act. Abū 'l-Hudhail supposed that man is not only capable of acting in the instant of commencement, but also acts in it. Al-Nazzām and most of the Mu'tazilites seem, on the other hand, to have denied that man acts in that instant. In the second "time" the act is a completed act; it has been performed; it has been brought into existence; in the first it is an incipient act, an act coming into existence; and in neither case should it be said that man acts in it. But man is capable in the first "time" of the act [completed] in the second, and before the second "time" comes to be, it is said, "The act will be (will have been) performed in the second," then when the second "time" has come to be, [it is said], "The act has been performed."¹²²

The thesis propounded above raises, it is true, its own problems, but it seems to fit most of the statements which have been transmitted concerning Abū 'l-Hudhail's doctrine of "times" or "moments"; and if the thesis stands, then the orthodox Muslim argument for free-will rests, and always did rest, not upon any distinction between the mental and physical aspects of acts, as Dr. Watt seems occasionally to argue,¹²³ but solely upon the distinction between voluntary and involuntary acts, as he has recognized and pointed out in the case of the "Affirmers,"¹²⁴ the forerunners of the Orthodox in this respect as in so many others, and as al-Ash'arī himself bears witness,¹²⁵ who might have declared in the words of the New England Calvinist, Timothy Dwight, and with much the same connotation, that "men are intuitively conscious of their own free agency, being irresistibly sensible that they act spontaneously and without any coercion or constraint,"¹²⁶ if only "agency" be held to the sense of "acquisition," meaning an act, or rather the quality of an act, which happens by virtue of a created power. For al-Ash'arī remained at all times irresistibly sensible of the sovereignty of God and conscious of man's creatureliness, which lends to his thought a grim logic and a psychological realism beyond the reach of even a New England Calvinist.

WILLIAM THOMSON

Harvard University

¹²² See notes 109 and 110; cf. Horten, *Phil. Problems*, p. 183 and 183, note 2; According to Allāf man is active by "choice" in the first, even if the act is only real in the second. From the first to the second moment the coming-to-be of the choice and the act take place.

¹²³ Watt, p. 168; cf. pp. 71, 72, 75, 77.

¹²⁴ Watt, pp. 111, 114, 167.

¹²⁵ C. I. 68.18-69.1; cf. the Mu'tazilite, Wāṣil b. 'Ata. C. I. 32.11-13. See note 17 for al-Ash'arī's statement.

¹²⁶ Cf. *The Harvard Theological Review* (October 1942), p. 242.

BOOK REVIEWS

Near East Panorama. By Glora M. Wysner. Illustrated by Philip J. Aziz. New York, Friendship Press, 1950, pp. 192, with map in color. Paper \$1.00; cloth \$1.50.

Miss Wysner's book is comprehensive, concise, clear and incisive. It interests quickly because it introduces persons to the reader. It instructs easily because it answers questions of geography, history, peoples and conditions that are of current vital importance. The panorama is packed with facts and moves swiftly. It becomes a series of living pictures are sure to have sequels that will concern all and that all will wish to understand.

The book has six chapters with informative appendices and a full index. The first chapter brings the Near East near by describing some personal problems typical of that area. Then the countries and their peoples are presented under the simile of an Oriental carpet with its great variety of colors, figures and design. No better comparison could have been chosen to portray and frame the area.

The third chapter describes the matter of chief concern to all the peoples of the Near East and indeed of all the Orient throughout all their history and that is still of utmost importance to them. In most of the world the life business of the people is their religion. In the Near East arose the three great monotheistic religions, but few of the followers of any of these religions have studied what the others taught or learned that religion, to be vital and valid, must be spiritual and true in its content and expression. As in the rest of the world, in the Near East the succeeding generations of the peoples reveal the results of their neglect of the true nature of religion. There too they experience the same strife, suffering, want and unhappiness known wherever God is not worshiped in spirit and in truth.

In chapters four and five Dr. Wysner describes the political, economic and intellectual situations and problems of the area. Here she is fair. But partisans may not approve, for she frankly states facts that are unfavorable to them and unpleasant on the record. But the spirit of the book justifies the report, for nothing is put down in ill-will. All can benefit from the accuracy of the account and the justness of the judgment.

The book well portrays the integration of religious allegiance with the political and other elements of Eastern society. This integration, so unfamiliar to modern Western Protestants, is the feature of life in the East that must be known before the difficulties of missionary work there can be understood. There is need to recognize that nationality and religion are synonymous and that changing one's religious allegiance is tantamount to communal disloyalty.

The Near East panorama is a part of the world panorama that is important for the West because it is now near in time, is strategic in position and is in desperate need of the values that can be supplied by the West. Those values are described in the last chapter of the book. The greatest of them is the greatest need of all the world—the Spirit of Christ—first revealed in the East and still needed there and everywhere.

If any readers note that the six credal tenets of Islam are not listed or described in this book, they may be informed that the official doctrines of Islam form the subject of this book's companion volume, *Introducing Islam*, by J. Christy Wilson.

EDWIN E. CALVERLEY

The Christian Message to Islam. By J. Christy Wilson. New York, Fleming H. Revell Company 1950, 189 pp. Price, \$2.25.

This book was written principally for those who are deeply concerned about the presentation of the Christian Message to Islam. Anyone interested in world affairs, however, should find much of value in it. The Christian missionary enterprise has exerted a vast effect upon the Muslim world in this century. No one can adequately estimate the value of the contribution which missionary institutions and individuals have made. "Present Day Issues" in the Near East have been prominent in newspapers headlines in recent years. The author has much to contribute to an understanding of these issues.

The long years of missionary labor in the Near East have resulted in comparatively few converts to Christianity from among Muslims. Have missionary methods been mistaken? What suggestions and what hope can be held out to those "who have toiled all night and taken nothing"? Dr. Wilson is eminently fitted to throw light on these important questions. During his twenty years of missionary service in Iran he was among those who had success in winning converts. He is able to pass on the encouragement of a growing evangelical church in Iran to those who sow the seed in ground even more beset with stones and thorns. As a charter member of a committee headed by Dr. John E. Merrill, formerly of Turkey, the author is one of those who have been making a "re-study of Muslim-Christian relations." Some of the findings of this committee's patient research are presented in this book.

Chapter 5 tells the stories of four outstanding Persian converts from Islam, while Chapter 6 presents the amazing experiences and victorious witness of Benjamin Badal, a colporteur and evangelist who was the son of Nestorian Christians of the Assyrian race. These biographies should furnish useful sermon material for pastors who wish to enlist their congregations in the Crusade of Love to the world of Islam. Since the mission study subject for 1950-51 is the Near East and Islam, this is an excellent book for those who desire material on evangelism.

ELEANOR T. CALVERLEY

Hartford, Conn.

Assignment: Near East. By James Batal. New York, Friendship Press, 1950, pp. 118. Paper \$1.00; cloth \$1.75.

James Batal, an American newspaperman whose parents had told him many stories of the "Old Country" where they had lived in Zahle, Lebanon, knew little of missionary work in the region of his forebears until, in 1943, he was assigned by the United States government to spend a year and a half in that part of the world. In fact he says he had expected to find missionaries "long-faced creatures with dour personalities and preachers simply of words." Those he met in

the Near East surprised him by having "pleasant dispositions and an eagerness to do some tangible good for the people, to make some practical contribution to better living." From the beginning of his travels he was continually meeting charming young nationals, both men and women, who could converse fluently with him in English due to their education in missionary or missionary-inspired schools and colleges. He tells us that twenty-nine of the ninety-two delegates and advisers who represented the Near East when the United Nations Charter was drawn up in San Francisco, were graduates of these same institutions.

After a prelude of his travel experiences Mr. Batal sketches the history of missionary work in the Near East, covering an expanse of thirteen decades. Those who are acquainted with the contributions of various Protestant denominations in healing the sick, teaching the illiterate, overcoming poverty through agricultural help, caring for orphans and preaching the gospel to those who have never before heard its message of hope will be glad to trace the course of all these services to their beginnings in Syria, Lebanon, Turkey, Palestine and the Hashimite Kingdom of Jordan, North Africa, Egypt and the Sudan, Iran, Iraq and Arabia.

This small book, copiously illustrated with excellent photographs will make delightful reading both for friends of missionary work in the Near East and for those who, like the author in previous years, know little about it.

ELEANOR T. CALVERLEY

Education in Arab Countries of the Near East. By Roderic D. Matthews and Matta Akrawi. Washington, D. C., The American Council on Education, 1949, pp. xi, 576, and Index.

Those interested in the life and culture of the Muslim World will find much of interest in this book. The authors spent eleven months visiting six Arab countries to gather the material on the ground. They were given full cooperation in the gathering of reports, statistics, and impressions from both official and private sources. They saw hundreds of schools, conducted by a variety of organizations, ranging from village schools to great universities. They talked with teachers of all ranks, with school administrators, and with the highest educational authorities in all of the lands visited. They took plenty of time to digest the mass of information gathered, and to integrate it thoroughly with their personal observations. The outcome, naturally, is a wealth of material, authenticated, clearly presented and sifted to present the information most valuable for a study of education in the Arab World.

There are, of course, certain limitations inherent in the method. The very mass of material makes the book a bit forbidding to the general public. Any but an enthusiast will do well to skip and scan a bit, or to start with certain leads in the index, or to limit his reading to that particular country in which he is particularly interested, until he gets the feel of it all. The care with which the material was sifted and prepared apparently involved a considerable delay, also, and the material published in 1949 is that gathered in 1946. In most cases the difference is insignificant, but in the case of the information about education in Palestine everything was changed in the interim.

Another limitation inherent in the compilation of the book is the necessity of presenting the system in each country apart, with the minimum of comparisons, direct or implied. One would wish that more contrasts might have been drawn, to point up strong or weak points in turn. At least, some comprehensive statistics and overall tables would have been useful.

The only exception to the rule of straightforward presentation of the material, country by country and without comment, is the closing section entitled "Interpretation." Whenever any writers delve into the relationship of Arab History to Arab Culture, discuss Western influences on the Orient, analyze present social forces at work in the Arab World, and then top it off with a discussion of the part—good and bad—played by foreign missionary and philanthropic institutions in the whole process, they are letting themselves in for misinterpretation and controversy. In their chapter on "Education and Cultural Change in the Arab World," however, the authors have done as balanced and convincing a piece of analysis as could be done in the space allotted. The average reader, in fact, might do well to read that last chapter first, as an introduction to the background of the problems dealt with in the sections describing educational work, country by country.

There are some very good photographs included, but of the nature of random snapshots rather than of a balanced representation of the educational facilities and activities found in the Arab Lands of the Near East. The graphs, also, are fine, and one could only wish for more.

For a work of this size, and gathered from various sources, there are surprisingly few inaccuracies. Even the correct use of the term "Near East" is maintained throughout (though the wartime confusion with the Middle East is still found in the Arabic title on the jacket and the title page).

Educators will find the prevailing pattern of education in the Arab Lands to be on the "Latin" model. Sociologists will be surprised at the revelation of basic similarities between "Arabic culture" and "Western thought-patterns." Students of Islam will find in the description of the University of al-Azhar information not otherwise available in English. Any and all readers of the work will be impressed with the fullness and the fairness of its picture of education as it was in 1946 in Arab Lands of the Near East.

ALFORD CARLETON

Aleppo, Syria

Arab Refugees, A Survey of Resettlement Possibilities. By S. G. Thicknesse. London, Royal Institute of International Affairs, 1949, pp. viii + 68.

This report, prepared by members of Chatham House and of the Royal Central Asian Society, is a good theoretical study of what might be done toward resettling the Arab refugees from Palestine. It gives more attention to statistical than to subjective matters, but does take into account most of the political and economic difficulties involved.

The introduction refers to the then pending activities of the Economic Survey Mission for the Middle East, under the U.N. Palestine

Conciliation Commission, and indicates a hope that this report might be instructive to the mission. It seems clear that this was not the case, as a few examples will indicate:

The Thicknesse group determined that a total of \$225,308,000 at the least would be required to resettle the three-quarters of a million refugees outside the present boundaries of Israel. The U.N. Economic Survey Mission recommended only \$54,000,000, to be spent over a period of eighteen months on temporary work relief projects. (Even this amount has not been fully subscribed by member nations.)

The Royal Institute report noted the inability of the Middle Eastern countries to support the refugees permanently without outside aid. The latest U.N. proposals envisage the entire refugee problem being off U.N. hands and in the hands of the Arab states at the end of the eighteen month period.

The Thicknesse group investigated the chance for repatriation. They found that, in actual fact, this was a physical, as well as a political impossibility. The report referred, however, to the U.N. General Assembly recommendation that refugees so wishing should be permitted to return to their homes; that compensation should be paid those not desiring to return; that the Conciliation Commission should "facilitate the repatriation, resettlement, and economic and social rehabilitation of the refugees and the payment of compensation." Miss Thicknesse commented:

"The Palestine archives of the United Nations are full of examples of such 'wishful thinking', and Palestine is scarred with the results. It would have been much better if the realities of the situation had been honestly faced, and if every effort had been devoted to showing Arab refugees how and why their chances for repatriation were limited, and to providing an immediate alternative by which the disappointed majority of the refugees could hope for an improved life elsewhere."

The present U.N. works relief program continues to side-step this very important issue, no doubt in view of the highly volatile political factors involved.

The Royal Institute report opens with a few background remarks on the situation of the refugees, beginning in November 1947, when the U.N. adopted the partition scheme for Palestine. It describes how they are living today, though not detailing the shocking conditions under which most of them are forced to exist.

The report takes note of the highly important morale factor, pointing out that, as time passes, the morale of the refugees deteriorates (as well as their health and general physical well-being). Even a temporary works relief program is complicated by the fact that the refugees will have nothing to do with it if they suspect it implies permanent resettlement outside of Palestine. It will be a difficult proposition indeed, not only to remove the idea of repatriation, but also to direct this bitter and destitute multitude into constructive activity in foreign lands, which are themselves poor and insecure, and where the Palestinians know themselves unpopular wards.

The last half of the report is a consideration in detail of resettlement possibilities in the various Arab states. These surveys, however, serve to emphasize the hopelessness of the situation. Besides the great expense (\$225,308,000), schemes calling for construction of dams and development of new agricultural areas would require a

number of other factors which are lacking: considerable technical ability or outside assistance; collaboration among the Middle Eastern states, where one area project would involve several nations (e.g., the Jordan River development project); agreement by the Arab States to take in the refugees as permanent inhabitants.

Unfortunately, the schemes proposed in this report appear too optimistic, in view of the complications of the situation and the temper of the times. It is regrettable that U.N. policies have not been directed toward bolder plans, such as those outlined in this report. However, the U.N. clearly wishes the problem of Arab refugees off its hands. As there are no private or other governmental agencies likely to come to the rescue, it appears that this report on resettlement possibilities will eventually be found under "permanently unfinished business." What will happen in the end to the refugees remains still a question.

ANNE KNIGHT

Longmeadow, Mass.

What Would You Do? When Christian Ethics Conflict with Standards of Non-Christian Cultures. By Daniel J. Fleming. New York, Friendship Press, 1949, pp. 172 and Notes and Index. \$2.25.

Professor Fleming's graceful pen is at its liveliest in the series of discussions here offered us of questions which inevitably put themselves when the Christian Movement enters new territory, and its standards come into conflict not only with slippery or slipshod mores in particular instances, but also and basically with the classical morals of other cultures as self-respecting as our own and, it may be, far older.

It is not too difficult to ascertain and state the distinctive principles of Christian ethics. But to reduce these general principles to specific rules which will cover all cases arising under them is clearly impossible. For circumstances alter cases, even to the extent now and then that what is right in one case is wrong in another.

That consideration will hardly be disputed by any competent moralist. It is the basis of the art of casuistry. Casuistry can never be a science. It calls for imagination and flair as well as learning. But it does not deserve a bad name on that account. It takes on a sinister aspect only when it becomes artful instead of sincere; a contrast which is like that between theatrical and dramatic.

Mr. Fleming is palpably sincere in these presentations. He deals not at all with abstract theories, but wholly in concrete situations as they have actually occurred of late years in mission lands, and with prickly problems of conscience to which such situations give rise.

The difficulties arising for Christian work in Muslim communities, with good faith on both sides, are amply presented and sympathetically discussed. As readers of this review are well aware, these are by no means the least troublesome of the issues which Christian missions confront. Mr. Fleming fully shares this awareness.

But he does not attempt or pretend to dispel perplexities for us, in these or other instances. He simply states cases, and points out the challenge they involve. He then invites us to think out our own conclusions.

In the process we learn charity and humility, beside sharpening our wits. We shall not be complacent as to Occidental superiority or the inerrancy of our own moral judgment when we finish reading these pages. We shall not soon or lightly get through with the thinking which they force us to do.

One wishes that not only all missionaries in service and all candidates under appointment, but all members of every mission board, might be required to read this book, deceptively pleasant in style, healthfully disturbing in content. That might do for a beginning. If the general public would read it too, the prospect would be brighter for world understanding.

RUSSELL HENRY STAFFORD

The Hartford Seminary Foundation

North African Notebook. By Robin Maugham. New York, Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1949, pp. 146. \$3.00.

Robin Maugham's most recent book is well named. He has written in brief, informal fashion of his impressions gathered during a recent trip across North Africa. The author's journey began in August, 1947, when he left Paris and headed for Spain. It ended in February, 1948, in Cairo. During this six month period Mr. Maugham travelled through the Arab lands of North Africa: Spanish and French Morocco, Algeria, Tunisia and Libya.

The purpose of this journey was to discover what was happening in the Arab lands which lie along the southern shore of the Mediterranean. Here are six countries occupied by different European powers, lacking in adequate communication, and in varying stages of development. Yet the author believed they should be studied together because of the factors they have in common. Each has a predominately Arab population; they are centers of political and social unrest which has increased because of their growing desire for independence; the Arab League is a potent force in each country; and they are bound together through their common allegiance to Islam. In dealing with the separate countries Mr. Maugham follows the same general pattern. He sketches vividly his first impressions of the country and the people. Then he gives an account of his interviews with the various political leaders, both Arab and European. There follows criticism and advice to all concerned.

North African Notebook brings to a clear focus the bankrupt state of these countries: conditions are described realistically, yet sympathetically. Conditions of poverty, injustice, oppression, unrest, and in many cases, hopelessness. The blame is laid unequivocally at the door of the ruling powers. Spain has transferred the Franco regime to her North Africa sphere where fascism is the order of the day. France has been in Morocco and Algeria for over one hundred years and yet she has achieved little in the way of developing her dependencies or building up friendship with the Arab peoples. As for Italy, the wrongs she has committed in Libya since her occupation of the country in 1911 are legion. Her rule is more accurately described as "ruthless conquest" than as "occupation." Mr. Maugham calls on those ruling powers to change their methods in dealing with the North African countries. They must recognize that independence

will come there as it has come to the Arabs of Egypt and the Levant, and they must try to build new relationships based on mutual dependence. As Messali Hadj, the leader of the extremist party in Algeria, said, "Independence will come in Algeria. That is inevitable. Either it will come in agreement with France and with her help, or it will come without her and against her."

This book leaves no doubt as to the author's interest in and devotion to the Arab cause. There are some three dozen photographs which add to the value of the book.

A. R. STEVENSON

New York City

Land of Enchanters. Edited and introduced by Bernard Lewis, with an additional introductory note by Battiscombe Gunn. London, Harvill Press, 1948, pp. 157.

This volume is a collection of nineteen folk tales selected from four thousand years of Egyptian story-telling. The first story comes from the Middle Kingdom—about 1900 B.C.—and the last is the work of Mahmud Taimur in 1925.

It is the editor's contention that the "continuity of social life" in the Nile Valley can be clearly seen through the popular "love of tales and the manner of telling them." To "trace the variation and enrichment of a few basic themes" he has selected five stories from Ancient Egypt, one from a Greek in Egypt (Herodotus), two from Christian Egypt, and eleven from Muslim Egypt. In an eighteen page introduction the editor, who is Reader in the History of the Middle East at the University of London, discusses the implications of these tales and provides a brief survey of the literary periods of Egypt's long cultural history. The review of the emergence of modern literature in Arabic is useful, but is limited only to the story-tellers and does not include such outstanding figures in modern belles-lettres as Taha Hussein and Lutfy el Said.

The translation of the stories is unusually good. Although all the ancient tales have been translated before—some of them many times—fresh versions have been prepared by Professor Battiscombe Gunn of the University of Oxford. Dr. Lewis has himself translated most of the stories from the Arabic.

This book is both pleasant to read and useful in its field of Egyptian folk-lore. The illustrations, by the Egyptian artist Ali Nur, are unusually good, with just the suggestion of the fantastic that fits them to their theme.

JOHN S. BADEAU

American University at Cairo, Egypt

Azharu 'l-ash'ar, Modern Arabic Poetry. An Anthology with English Verse Translations. By Arthur J. Arberry. Cambridge Oriental Series, Number One. London, Taylor's Foreign Press, 1950, pp. English, 70; Arabic, 70 with two indices. 30s.

As an example of book craft, this first of the Cambridge Oriental Series will refresh the eye of Oriental and Orientalist alike. As an example of scholarship its content is the product of the collaboration of Arab students and a British teacher of Arabic, so that its trustworthiness has double assurance. As an example of poetic art the poems,

both in their Arabic original and their English translation, gratify, for they stir the emotions that belong with the ideas they impart.

Professor Arberry's Preface describes the origin and aim of the anthology. A group of advanced students from Arabic language homes brought to his weekly seminar verses by modern Arabic authors of different countries, including the Americas. The group freely discussed the content and form of the verses, translated them and chose poems which also represented current artistic, social and political influences in their communities. These poems, selected by the whole group, Dr. Arberry later put into verse, varying the rhyme and rhythm to preserve some of the different Arabic metrical style and poetic flavor.

The Arabic verses were transcribed (with amazingly few mistakes), splendidly spaced and photoprinted on colored paper (the East knows that white paper is not the best for the sight) and bound to form the front of a Arabic book. All but two of the English translations begin on pages with the corresponding numbers at what is the front of the book, Western style. The indices are in the center of the united work.

The result is a beautiful and inspiring example of the collaboration of East and West in art and craft, of mind and hand in thought and skill and will give the joy of Keats whenever and wherever it is handled and read.

EDWIN E. CALVERLEY

Arab Dhows of Eastern Arabia. By Richard LeBaron Bowen, Jr. Rehoboth, Mass. Privately printed, 1949, pp. x, 54, 19 collotype illustrations, 18 line drawings. \$2.75. (To be had from the author at 173 Columbus Ave., Pawtucket, R. I.)

This excellent monograph is reprinted from *The American Neptune* of April 1949. It presents the results of first-hand experience and investigation on the spot and later careful research in the literature of the subject. It is brought to the attention of our readers as another example of the influence of the Arabs upon Western civilization on which our *QUARTERLY* has published some articles.

The book is a thorough description of the use and value of the lateen rig of sailing craft in its probable original home, whence it has spread to other seas, notably the Mediterranean. The present reviewer has only insignificant additions to make to the account, probably omitted by the author because they were too trivial for his notice.

The boats described are built chiefly of teak wood because, if made of any other wood, when on the beach they would be devoured by termites ("white ants"). When the boats are laid up for the winter, a plug in the bottom is removed so that the bilge may escape. When the keel is laid out in the building yard, a watch is set by the builder to keep neighborhood wives wanting children from leaping over it as a preliminary to pregnancy. A successful leap would result in the death of either the boat-builder or the owner, to compensate for the new life that would be gained. So the watch is kept until the sides of the boat are too high for any woman to hurdle.

E. E. C.

History of the Nation of the Archers. By the Monk Grigor, translated by R. W. Blake and R. N. Frye, with Dissertation on Mongol terms by F. W. Cleaves. Cambridge, Harvard-Yenching Institute, 1949.

The *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* for December, 1949, devotes 175 pages to the "History of the Nation of the Archers" (Mongols), written in 1272 A.D. by the monk Grigor, of the cloister of Akanc (Akantz) in Cilician Armenia, and now translated, with accompanying descriptive and historical text, by two Harvard professors, Robert W. Blake (in whose untimely death, Oriental study in America has suffered a great loss) and Richard N. Frye; while another Harvard scholar, Francis Woodman Cleaves, contributes an exhaustive and invaluable 44-page dissertation upon the Mongolian names and terms appearing in Grigor's work. The entire task was done under the auspices of the Harvard-Yenching Institute.

European scholars long ago recognized the value of Armenian classic literature as a source for research in various fields. The more than one hundred Armenologists of the past century have been mostly French, German and English. The United States, though generous towards the social and educational needs of Near East peoples, have lagged in the exploration of their intellectual heritages. It is therefore heartening to an Armenian to find this comparatively pioneer work by three distinguished Americans so well carried out.

It was no minor task to which they set themselves, that of rendering into English an opus in what may be considered classical Armenian (*grabar*), with a commingling of the vernacular or vulgar dialect of Cilicia, to which careless copyists and later, ignorant compositors had, through the ages, contributed numerous errors. Grappling with such difficulties, by assiduous comparisons among the three available copies of Grigor's work, in Jerusalem, Venice and Paris, the editors noted more than 600 variants. They begin their work with a recital of what is known of the history of these manuscripts, and with demolishing the long-current legend which attributed the authorship of this history to a monk named Maghakia, who, as now seems definitely established, was not the writer. Grigor, the real author, never left his Cilician homeland, but he heard much about the "Archers" from persons who had been in Mongolia, likewise from Eastern Armenian visitors to his cloister. At his disposal, too, were the written narratives of Vanakan, the great educator, and of his pupils, Kirakos, Vardan and Vahram. His narrative, covering a period of only forty-four years, depicts the westward sweep of the Tatar-Mongols, their conflicts with the Muslim forces and their diplomatic contacts with Europe. His description of their personal appearance, evidently from the gossip of sojourners, is horrific in the extreme.

Of course their invasion was not completed when Grigor wrote. In fact, in 1300, their Great Khan, Ghazan, captured Jerusalem, and had among his numerous royal vassals King Hetum II of Armenia. But only three years later, his army was utterly crushed by the Muslims, and the Mongol Empire faded from the Near-Eastern scene, though inevitably leaving behind it noticeable effects upon manners, customs, language and nomenclature.

In this work of Drs. Blake and Frye, each page of Grigor's text,

printed in Armenian type, is faced by its translation into English, and all copiously annotated. We Armenians may quibble a little here and there with the shades of meaning given to certain words in their rendering, but these are minor matters in comparison with the painstaking excellence of the accomplishment as a whole. In addition to the notes and references, a bibliography, a reproduction of the Armenian alphabet and an index of names complete a highly valuable contribution to learning.

VAHAN M. KURKJIAN

New York City

A Guide to Turkish Area Study. By John Kingsley Birge. Washington, American Council of Learned Societies, 1949, pp. 240. \$2.50, postpaid in U.S.A. if remittance accompanies order, otherwise, \$3.00. Available from A.C.L.S., 1219 Sixteenth St., N.W., Washington 6, D.C.

Dr. Birge's *Guide* is a concise, thoughtful discussion of a wide range of different aspects of Turkish life. The account revolves around 587 carefully selected bibliographical references to Turkey written in the major western European languages, which excludes Russian. Each book is numbered and listed in a general bibliography for easy cross reference. A full genealogical table of the Ottoman dynasty, and a helpful general chronology of Turkish History are also included.

Using the *Guide* as a starting point, anyone willing to read extensively may, in a much shorter time than has been possible heretofore, acquire a broad appreciation of the entire Turkish "area." The author defines this term in the comprehensive manner indicated by the following chapter headings: Sources of general information; geography; population and races; language and literature; history, including foreign relations; political structure; social organization, including women, home, sports, health and village life; transport and communications; finance, industry and commerce; education and intellectual life; religion; art, and music. Moreover, within these general categories, those with specialist interests can facilitate their particular investigation by using this handbook as an index to a wealth of detailed material. Serious students of Turkish affairs in the United States have used the book in galley proof for three years.

This volume was written more than five years ago when the author was in charge of the Army Special Training Program in Turkish at Princeton University. Although it does not, in consequence, include the encouraging amount of good new material which has appeared since 1945, the recent *Report of the Committee on Near Eastern Studies of the A.C.L.S.* recognizes the timeliness of this book and indicates an urgent need for comparable Guides to encourage study of adjacent areas.

Realizing full well that this book is the mature and generous product of a lifetime of study and association with Turkey and its people, this reviewer nevertheless succumbs to the temptation to propose a few additions. A separate chapter on agriculture would be most welcome if sufficient references are available. The author's brevity on this basic subject probably reflects a lamentable shortage

of relevant published material. An old, but useful, study is P. A. von Tischendorff's *Das Lehnswesens in den moslemischen Staaten, insbesondere im osmanischen Reiche*, Leipsig, 1872.

Other suggestions, with references to subject and pages in the *Guide*, follow: Literature, p. 60. Rouillard, C. D., *The Turk in French history, thought and literature, 1520-1660*, Paris, [1941], complements Chew. Ottoman history, p. 76. Mahmud Rayf, *Tableau des nouveaux réglemens de l'Empire ottoman*, . . . Constantinople, 1798, and the relevant works of Juchereau de St. Denys, Andreossy, A. Grassi, H. von Moltke and Jouannin deal with the early reforms under Selim III and Mahmud II which had so important a bearing on the *Tanzimat* period that it would be helpful to include such contemporary sources. *Tanzimat*, p. 77. Rosen, G., *Geschichte der Türkei* . . . 1826-1856, 2 v., Leipsig, 1866. As the author had access to secret Prussian archives and knew personally the Turkish leaders of the first half of the *Tanzimat* period, this seems a worthy companion to Engelhardt. Foreign Relations, U.S., p. 87. The *Dictionary of American Biography* contains articles on distinguished Americans connected with Turkey. The Treaty section, p. 89, could mention where to find the texts of the Saadabad Pact and Balkan Entente treaties of the 1930's. Toynbee, A. J., *Survey of International Affairs*, and Birge's "Turkey Between Two World Wars," *Foreign Policy Reports*, XX, 16 (November, 1944), merit inclusion here. Foreign observers of the Ottoman Empire, p. 94. Bertrand de la Brocquière's account of his pilgrim travels in Turkey and visit at the court of Murad II in Adrianople about the year 1433 might join this list for his description of the Ottoman state prior to the capture of Constantinople when the true Empire began. Transportation, p. 107. Stripling, G. W. F., wrote *The Ottoman Turks and the Arabs, 1511-1574* (Illinois Studies in the Social Sciences, XXVI, 4), Urbana, 1942, as an extension of the two articles on oriental trade routes by Lybyer which are cited. Finance, p. 115. Hines, W. D., Kemmerer, E. W., et al., *Report of the Hines-Kemmerer Commission, 1933-34*. In addition to the special Turkish edition listed, a three volume English typewritten copy of this report is now in the Princeton University Library. It is hoped that future editions of this *Guide* will include information on motion pictures and as many maps and photographs as practicable. Perfectionists will find ample room for picayune criticism of minor errors. Such points appear inconsequential when set beside the valuable achievement of this book.

Dr. Birge has served in Turkey since 1913 and is currently director of the Publication Department of the American Board in Istanbul. In addition to several articles on Turkey, he has also published an important study of *The Bektashi Order of Dervishes*, Hartford and London, 1937, and was an editor of the latest revision of Redhouse's monumental *English and Turkish Lexicon*, Istanbul, 1950. In all fairness, one should indicate that the author's contributions to Turkish scholarship have been made possible by the generous policy of the American Board. It is a privilege to acknowledge here the sincere obligation which the reviewer owes to Dr. Birge for un-

remitting kindness and encouragement in Turkish studies—a debt shared by many other American students, travelers, business men and government officials who will welcome this latest book.

HOWARD A. REED

Princeton, N. J.

Enige beschouwingen over de ontwikkeling van het Indonesisch Nationalisme op Sumatra's Westkust. By Dr. H. Bouman. Groningen, Batavia, J. B. Wolters, 1949, pp. 119. f 3.90.

Mens en Vrijheid in Indonesie. By Dr. C. A. O. Van Nieuwenhuijze. N. V. Uitgeverij W. Van Hoeve —'s Gravenhage/Banding, 1949, pp. 214.

Since the creation of the new nations of Asia, there is bound to be a body of literature, scholarly and otherwise, seeking to retell, analyze, and interpret the new movements that have lead to nationhood. The two books in question here have to do with the Indonesian approach to independence, and deal with the same fundamental problems. The first one listed above, *Some Observations on the Development of Indonesian Nationalism on the West Coast of Sumatra*, is a specific analysis of what is happening, and why, in a limited area of Indonesia. The other, *Man and Freedom in Indonesia*, is a more general treatment of the total area, and the over-all factors involved in recent history. It is often true in Western works on the history and culture of the Orient, that the type of analysis to which we are accustomed simply does not arrive at conclusions acceptable to those about whom such articles are written. Our Western analyses are based on the historical factors which would be of most importance to us, and not on those which really determine the history of most intuitive peoples. This judgment could not be pronounced on either of the two books here involved. Both of them recognize that one can not talk about "nationalism," but about "nationalisms"—not concerning freedom without specific interpretations of that freedom depending on the culture-complex, or better, the culture-complexes, involved in the local development of the concept of freedom and independence.

In Dr. Bouman's study of Sumatra's West Coast, he insists that "The History of the development of Indonesian nationalism should be written only after a thorough study has been made of the nationalist tendencies that have been made in each separate region of Indonesia." This he attempts to do in relation to Minangkabau. He makes a distinction between the nationalism which is a healthy indication of a love of culture and the nationalism that seeks to establish a strong and dominant state. He believes that there is something more to the search for freedom than merely release from colonial domination or a sentimental pride in one's own heritage. This latter will inevitably survive after political problems are no longer concerned with independence. The nationalism centered in cultural pride is often, through the stimulus of acculturation, a reconstructed past which may never historically have existed in the form in which it is dreamed, but is a real and potent factor in the construction of constitutions and the making of governments.

The specific elements with which both of these documents deal are first and foremost the Muslim backgrounds of the people. Islam has undoubtedly been a tremendous stimulus to Indonesian nationalism

as we have seen it to be a stimulus for the solidarity and patriotism of peoples of the nearer East—particularly in Pakistan. The elements in Islam which would cooperate with some of the newer factors in the political situation, such as communism, are evaluated as to their probable effect on the political future of the area involved. Some years ago certain thinkers of Holland, among whom are Snouck Hurgronje, the scholar, and van Mook, the economist, were of the opinion that freedom in Asia should be a cooperative enterprise between East and West rather than, as has developed, a struggle of the East against the colonial powers of the West. It is still not too late for an understanding and cooperation of the Western powers with the new governments of Southeast Asia.

Mens en Vrijheid is a courageous attempt to meet the facts of the situation in Indonesia with an understanding of all of the factors involved. It is useless here to discuss the specific points which he raises in relation to a possible democratic future. The main chapter headings will perhaps be of assistance in knowing what are the areas of discussion. After a general introduction, Dr. Van Nieuwenhuijze discusses the political structure and religious freedom; Islam and spiritual freedom; "Totalitarian" society and freedom—totalitarian in the sense of a cultural entity which faces the rest of the world as an organic whole—a unique society, outside of which there is no life possible in the full sense of the word. The chapter numbered four in the text is of great significance in that it brings the findings of the social sciences to bear on culture and the evolving political scene. Chapter five is on "Christianity and Freedom," which includes church organizations and the organization of society, Christianity and democracy, and Christianity and the Indonesian sphere of living, or culture. The sixth chapter deals with communism and freedom with an interesting differentiation between Soviet Russian Marxism and the communism of Indonesia. This chapter is suggestive for a study of the communisms of Burma, India, China, etc., as well as of Indonesia.

Your reviewer can express little critical comment on the factual bases of these two works. It has been very revealing, however, to know that such studies are in progress, leading to a realistic understanding of the new nations of the Orient, and to a constructive cooperation with them in the common political and cultural problems of the world.

Dr. Bouman's book has an index and bibliography.

MALCOLM PITT

The Hartford Seminary Foundation

"The Muslim Sunrise"

The organ of the Qadiani Ahmadi mission in America, formerly published in Chicago, Ill., and now in Washington, D.C., has the following announcement in its issue for the first quarter of 1950:

"From this issue of the magazine, we have changed its name from "The Moslem Sunrise" to "THE MUSLIM SUNRISE". This is to conform with the right pronunciation of the word *Muslim* (meaning, one who submits to Allah). We had reluctantly followed the American spelling in the past but now we feel that the time has come to introduce the spelling which is closer to the right word.—Editor."

Chinese Muslim Pilgrims Fly to Arabia

"In September last year some 130 would-be pilgrims passed through Hongkong on their way to Mecca. They came mostly from China's Northwest, by plane, and in the Colony chartered BOAC planes to take them to Jidda, from where they would start the pilgrimage to Mecca. Babies, women and old men made up the party. In Hongkong they stayed at the mosque on the island before taking passage to Jidda."

From the July 1950 issue of *Friends of Moslems* quarterly.

Work Among Muslims in Hyderabad

"Work among Muslims in Hyderabad State for the last few decades has been extremely difficult. They were a small ruling minority holding nearly all the important government posts. They were determined to preserve their regime and any defection from their ranks was regarded as treacherous. Naturally the lot of any convert was almost impossibly difficult. In spite of this there were a few men of sterling worth who dared the hazards of persecution for the sake of the Gospel. Their path was beset by hardships. It was not easy for them to feel at home in a predominately Telegu Church because of differences in language and culture. It was almost impossible for them to get married to women of their own sort. There were no women converts in spite of much devoted labour in the zenanas. The Muslim community invariably began an intensive drive to entice them back. Some fell by the wayside. The very few who stood firm were seriously affected by the strain.

"In the inevitable disorganisation following the arrival of the military there was considerable looting and persecution of Muslims by undisciplined youths. Five hundred Muslims took refuge in the (Cathedral) compound. Somehow or other we provided tents or classrooms or huts. An Officer, who arrived wounded, was nursed in a bungalow. Gangs claiming to be hunting alleged Razzakars attempted to invade the compound, but were persuaded to desist. The stress of the situation broke down barriers of prejudice. We were urged to come into the zenanas, behind poor little curtains on bamboo poles, to calm the terrified women and assure them of our protection.

C. DERMOTT MONAHAN

in *Bulletin of the Henry Martyn School of Islamic Studies*
for January-March, 1950

SURVEY OF PERIODICALS

I. GENERAL

AL-AHRAM—THE *Times* OF THE ARAB WORLD. Helen A. Kitchen. (In *The Middle East Journal*, Washington, D. C. April, 1950. pp. 155-169).

"The Pyramids" is the paper to its Arabic-reading public and the Taqla family has set a high standard of editorial independence ever since 1875.

CATALOGUE DES MANUSCRITS ARABES DE LA SOCIÉTÉ ASIATIQUE DE PARIS. G. Vajda. (In *Journal Asiatique*, Paris. 1950, part 1. pp. 1-30).

A thorough description of 66 works.

A GNOSTIC LIBRARY FROM UPPER EGYPT. Jean Doresse. (In *Archaeology*, New York. Summer, 1950. pp. 69-73).

Describes the discovery and classifying of early Coptic mss. found by chance by Arab villagers digging at the foot of the Gebel-et Tarif, north of Luxor.

GRAMMATISCH SCHWIERIGE SCHWUR UND BESCHGWÖRUNGSFORMELN DES KLASSISCHEN ARABISCH. A. Fischer. (In *Der Islam*, Berlin. Mai, 1949. pp. 1-105).

Detailed study in Arabic and German.

NOMS ET SURNOMS DE MAMELOUKS. J. Sauvaget. (In *Journal Asiatique*, Paris. 1950, part 1. pp. 31-58).

An annotated list.

II. ARABIA

THE BADU OF SOUTHERN ARABIA. W. P. Thesiger. (In the *Royal Central Asian Journal*, London. January, 1950. pp. 53-61).

An account of the characteristics and way of life of the hardy camel-owning nomads of the Empty Quarter.

THE GOLDEN JUBILEE IN SA'UDI ARABIA. H. St.J. Philby. (In the *Royal Central Asian Journal*, London. April, 1950. pp. 112-125).

A glowing description of the wise administration of Ibn Sa'ud.

THE HADHRAMI BEDOUIN LEGION. A. M. Clark Hutchinson. (In the *Royal Central Asian Journal*, London. January, 1950. pp. 62-65).

Tells of a local security force modelled on the Arab Legion.

A JOURNEY BY TWO JESUITS FROM DHUFĀR TO SAN'Ā IN 1590. C. F. Beckingham and R. B. Serjeant. (In *The Geographical Journal*, London. June, 1950. pp. 194-207).

Quotes from the Journal of Fr. Pedro Paez, who, with Antonio de Monserrat, travelled widely in Arabia as prisoners of the Arabs.

LITERATURE ON THE KINGDOM OF SAUDI ARABIA. George Rentz. (In *The Middle East Journal*, Washington, D. C. April, 1950. pp. 244-249).

An annotated bibliography.

III. HISTORY OF ISLAM

THE DAR UL-ISLAM MOVEMENT IN WESTERN JAVA. C. A. O. van Nieuwenhuijze. (In *Pacific Affairs*, New York. June, 1950. pp. 169-183).

Gives an historical survey of the efforts to realize an ideal Muslim state in Indonesia.

DEVELOPMENTS OF THE QUARTER: COMMENT AND CHRONOLOGY. (In *The Middle East Journal*, Washington, D. C. April, 1950. pp. 209-218).

Covers from December 1, 1949 to February 28, 1950.

MEHMED'S II FRÜHESTER STAATSVERTRAG. F. Babinger and F. Dolger. (In *Orientalia Christiania Periodica*, Roma. 1949, part 3-4. pp. 225-258).

Greek text, with translation and notes, of a treaty of friendship between the Turkish Sultan and the Republic of Venice in 1446.

MEHMED'S II HEIRAT MIT SITT-CHATUN (1449). F. Babinger. (In *Der Islam*, Berlin. November, 1849. pp. 217-235).

An historical article illustrated with twelve plates principally of the Mosque of Sitt-Chatun in Adrianople.

DER VERLAUF DER ISLAMISIERUNG PERSIENS. Bertold Spuler. (In *Der Islam*, Berlin. July, 1949. pp. 63-76).

An account of the conversion of Persia to Islam.

IV. QUR'AN. TRADITION. THEOLOGY

THE ARABIC SOURCES FOR THE LIFE OF SALADIN. H. A. R. Gibb. (In *Speculum*, Cambridge, Mass. January, 1950. pp. 58-72).

Discusses in detail the Barq and Fath of 'Imâdeddîn, the Life of Saladin by Bahâ-eddin, the Two Gardens by Abû Shâma, and extracts from Ibn Abî Taiy.

UNE EXÉGÈSE CORANIQUE DU XII^e SIECLE EN PERSAN. Ali Asghar Hekmat. (In *Journal Asiatique*, Paris. 1950, part 1. pp. 91-96).

Describes a work entitled "Kašf al-asrâr wa-'uddat al-abrâr" attributed to al-Taftâzânî.

THE PROBLEM OF DIVORCE IN THE SHARIA LAW OF ISLAM. J. N. D. Anderson. (In the *Royal Central Asian Journal*, London. April, 1950. pp. 169-185).

A legal article citing the practices of the Hanafis, Malikis, etc. STEPPE UND STADT IM LEBEN DER ÄLTESTEN TÜRKEN. Annemarie von Gabain. (In *Der Islam*, Berlin. July, 1949. pp. 30-62).

A study of nomad and city life.

ZUR LEHRE DES TAFSIR ÜBER DEN BÖSEN BLICK. Raimund Köbert. (In *Der Islam*, Berlin. May, 1949. pp. 111-121).

Gives original text and translation.

V. RELIGIOUS AND SOCIAL LIFE

THE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT OF SOVIET CENTRAL ASIA. Paul B. Henze. (In the *Royal Central Asian Journal*, London. January, 1950. pp. 28-44).

A second article dealing with fuel, power, mineral resources and industry.

ECONOMIC REVIEW: THE MIDDLE EAST ECONOMY IN 1949. D. S. and P. G. Franck. (In *The Middle East Journal*, Washington, D. C. April, 1950. pp. 221-243).

A statistical presentation.

A NEW ERA IN TURKEY. K. M. Smogorzewski. (In *The Nineteenth Century and After*, London. June, 1950. pp. 356-362).

Discusses the advance in democratic government, especially well shown in the February, 1950, elections.

THE PALESTINE REFUGEES. (In the *Royal Central Asian Journal*, London. January, 1950. pp. 77-80).

The November, 1949, report of the United Nations Relief for Palestine Refugees.

POINT FOUR AND THE MIDDLE EAST. E. George Hakim. (In *The Middle East Journal*, Washington, D. C. April, 1950. pp. 183-195).

Tells of plans for economic development through technical assistance and capital investment.

RECENT PROGRESS IN AFGHANISTAN. Sir Giles Squire. (In the *Royal Central Asian Journal*, London. January, 1950. pp. 6-18).

Lack of funds is hampering the fine projects for which the Government is striving.

THE TEST OF DEMOCRACY IN TURKEY. Eleanor Bisbee. (In *The Middle East Journal*, Washington, D. C. April, 1950. pp. 170-182).

The 1950 elections demonstrated the results of the ever increasing constitutional reforms begun as early as 1826 and still progressing.

VI. POLITICAL RELATIONSHIPS

AFGHANISTAN: HIGHWAY OF CONQUEST. Arnold Fletcher. (In *Current History*, New York. June, 1950. pp. 337-341).

Indicates the political position of the country in relation to the United States and to Eastern neighbors.

THE GUARDIANSHIP OF THE SUEZ CANAL. Harford L. Hoskins. (In *The Middle East Journal*, Washington, D. C. April, 1950. pp. 143-154).

An historical article, closing with the thought that Anglo-American policy in the Middle East as a whole will be reflected in any future Anglo-Egyptian treaty negotiations.

KASHMIR AND JAMMU. (In *The Round Table*, London. June, 1950. pp. 215-219).

Suggests several bases to end the long dispute—a plebiscite leading to partition with minority commissions, a Joint Defence Commission, or an Indus Valley Authority.

THE LEBANON, 1948-1949. V. H. W. Dowson. (In the *Royal Central Asian Journal*, London. January, 1950. pp. 66-76).

Describes general conditions in the section and finds the religious situation displaying an encouraging spirit of give and take.

PERSIA'S PROGRESS DEPENDS ON COMMUNICATIONS. John M. Bee. (In *Great Britain and the East*, London. June, 1950. pp. 32-34).

Fourth in a series of articles on "Persia To-day".

VII. PAKISTAN

ANGLO-PAKISTAN TRADE. W. Godfrey. (In *Pakistan Horizon*, Karachi. December, 1949. pp. 188-198).

A statistical presentation.

BURMA AND PAKISTAN. Mushtaq Ahmad. (In *Pakistan Horizon*, Karachi. December, 1949. pp. 198-207).

Surveys economic and trade conditions in both countries and gives production statistics.

CONDITIONS IN INDIA AND PAKISTAN TO-DAY. Sir Percival Griffiths. (In *The Asiatic Review*, London. April, 1950. pp. 957-974).

An address accompanied by much discussion by a well-informed audience.

THE FOREIGN RELATIONS OF PAKISTAN. Altaf Husain. (In *The Asiatic Review*, London. April, 1950. pp. 939-956).

Discusses diplomatic approaches to the United States, Great Britain and Russia.

MINORITIES IN PAKISTAN—AN HISTORICAL SURVEY. Atiquzzaman Khan. (In the *Eastern World*, London. May, 1950. pp. 13-14).

The author believes that, true to the precepts of Muhammad, toleration of other faiths has been and still is the rule.

PAKISTAN: IMPROVING PROSPECTS OF PEACE. (In *The Round Table*, London. June, 1950. pp. 263-267).

The situation is more hopeful due to the mediation of the United Nations in the Kashmir and Afghan disputes and also because Bengal is calmer.

VIII. MISSIONS TO MUSLIMS

CHRISTIANS IN MOSLEM LANDS. (In *Catholic Missions*, New York. June-July, 1950. pp. 4-5).

Gives statistics for Muslims and Roman Catholics as well as for the total population.

LET THE PEOPLE READ. Ruth Ure. (In *World Dominion and The World To-day*, London. May-June, 1950. pp. 137-140).

Tells of the need for good Christian literature to distribute in India and Pakistan.

UNITY IN THE SUDAN. Christine de Peyer. (In *World Dominion and The World To-day*, London. May-June, 1950. pp. 155-156).

Describes the work of the Unity High School for Girls in Khartoum.

ANOTHER MINORITY PROBLEM. R. T. S. Goodchild. (In *World Dominion and The World To-day*, London. January-February, 1950. pp. 40-42).

Discusses the need for mission work among the numerous Moslems and Hindus in Uganda.

The Russell F. Moore Company, 475 Fifth Avenue, New York, has recently published an American edition of "The Tulip of Sināi" translated from the Persian of the late Sir Muhammad Iqbal by A. J. Arberry. The edition is available in cloth at \$2.00. A review of the book appeared in the January 1949 issue.